Study Report 2005-04

Sergeants as Drill Sergeants: Returning Sergeants to Drill Sergeant Duty

Gerald Klein, Margaret Salter, Julius W. Gates, Randall Sullivan and Henry Kinnison
The Wexford Group, International, Inc.

Martha Lappin
Alternative Healthcare Research

Scott E. Graham
U.S. Army Research Institute

United States Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

July 2005

U.S. Army Research Institute
for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

A Directorate of the Department of the Army
Deputy Chief of Staff, G1

Authorized and approved for distribution:

MICHELLE SAMS
Technical Director

ZITA M. SIMUTIS
Director

Research accomplished under contract
for the Department of the Army

The Wexford Group International, Inc.
and Alternative Healthcare Research

Technical Review by

Gregory A. Goodwin, U.S. Army Research Institute
Kathleen A. Quinkert, U.S. Army Research Institute

NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION: Primary distribution of this Study Report has been made by ARI. Please address correspondence concerning distribution of reports to: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Attn: DAPE-ARI-MS, 2511 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia 22202-3926

FINAL DISPOSITION: This Study Report may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

NOTE: The findings in this Study Report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. REPORT DATE (dd-mm-yy)	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED (from. . . to)
July 2005	Final	October 2003 – June 2005

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE	5a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER
Sergeants as Drill Sergeants: Returning Sergeants to Drill Sergeant Duty	W74V8H-04-F-0008
	5b. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 665803
6. AUTHOR(S) Gerald Klein, Margaret Salter, Julius W. Gates, Randall Sullivan, and Henry Kinnison (The Wexford Group International, Inc.); Martha Lappin (Alternative Healthcare Research); Scott E. Graham (U.S. Army Research Institute)	5c. PROJECT NUMBER D730
	5d. TASK NUMBER 300
	5e. WORK UNIT NUMBER
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) The Wexford Group, International 8618 Westwood Center Drive, Suite 200 Vienna, Virginia 22182	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral & Social Sciences ATTN: Infantry Forces Research Unit 2511 Jefferson Davis Highway Arlington, VA 22202-3926	10. MONITOR ACRONYM ARI
	11. MONITOR REPORT NUMBER Study Report 2005-04

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

Contracting Officer's Representative and Subject Matter Expert POC: Scott E. Graham

14. ABSTRACT *(Maximum 200 words)*:
The intent of this Study was to provide senior Army leadership with information to support a decision as to whether the Army should readmit Sergeants (E-5) to Drill Sergeant duty. Surveys, interviews, and analyses of performance in Drill Sergeant School and Initial Entry Training units consistently indicated that Sergeants (E-5) could perform successfully as Drill Sergeants. The graduation rates from Drill Sergeant School were equivalent for Sergeants (E-5) and Staff Sergeants. Supervisor ratings of Drill Sergeant performance in Initial Entry Training units found the Staff Sergeant (SSG) Drill Sergeants to be rated only slightly higher than the Sergeant (E-5) Drill Sergeants which was expected. Overall SGT (E-5) Drill Sergeant performance was rated "high." In addition, the SGT (E-5) Drill Sergeants were rated both "high" and equivalent to the SSG Drill Sergeants in a number of areas to include: respect for the trainees, ability to manage stress and handle volatile situations, and various gender integrated training issues. The interim results were provided to TRADOC DCSOPS&T in Nov 2004. Subsequently, the Commander, TRADOC, recommended to the Chief of Staff of the Army that a change be made to Army policy. In Feb 2005, the CSA directed that Sergeants be reinstated to Drill Sergeant duty.

15. SUBJECT TERMS

Drill Sergeant, Drill Sergeant School, Initial Entry Training

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF			19. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	20. NUMBER OF PAGES	21. RESPONSIBLE PERSON
16. REPORT	17. ABSTRACT	18. THIS PAGE			
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified	Unlimited	104	Ellen Kinzer Technical Publications Specialist 703-602-8047

Standard Form 298

Study Report 2005-04

Sergeants as Drill Sergeants: Returning Sergeants to Drill Sergeant Duty

Gerald Klein, Margaret Salter,
Julius W. Gates, Randall Sullivan,
and Henry Kinnison
The Wexford Group International, Inc.

Martha Lappin
Alternative Healthcare Research

Scott E. Graham
U.S. Army Research Institute

Infantry Force Research Unit
Scott E. Graham, Chief

U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences
2511 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia 22202-3926

July 2005

Army Project Number
665803D730

Personnel and Training
Analysis Activities

SERGEANTS AS DRILL SERGEANTS: RETURNING SERGEANTS TO DRILL SERGEANT DUTY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Research Requirement:

This study was performed for the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) to assess a Pilot Program which returned Sergeants – E-5 (SGTs) to Drill Sergeant duty. Current Senior Leaders, considering readmitting SGTs to Drill Sergeant status, required data on the impacts and effectiveness of using SGTs as Drill Sergeants. The Pilot Program occurred at three locations: Fort Jackson, Fort Benning and Fort Gordon.

Procedure:

The objectives of the study were to determine: how well SGTs handled stress and managed anger; the degree to which they were effective Drill Sergeants, how well the chain of command and Senior Drill Sergeants coached, mentored, and lead the SGT Drill Sergeants; and how effective the selection process and criteria were in identifying and selecting qualified Sergeants to be Drill Sergeants. A front end analysis of the requirements of the job of Drill Sergeant was conducted. Behaviorally anchored rating scales (BARS) were developed and administered while the SGT (E-5) Drill Sergeant candidates and their classmates were in Drill Sergeant School. Academic data were collected and key personnel interviewed. In the Initial Entry Training units, the BARS were again completed on each of the SGT Drill Sergeants, and Commanders and supervisors were interviewed on the effectiveness of the SGTs participating in the program.

Findings:

Surveys, interviews, and analyses of performance in Drill Sergeant School and Initial Entry Training units consistently indicated that 50 SGTs evaluated could perform successfully as Drill Sergeants. The graduation rates from Drill Sergeant School were equivalent for SGTs and Staff Sergeants (SSGs). Supervisor ratings of Drill Sergeant performance in the Initial Entry Training units found the SSG Drill Sergeants to be rated only slightly higher than the SGT Drill Sergeants which was expected. Overall SGT Drill Sergeant's performance was rated "high." In addition, the SGT Drill Sergeants were rated both "high" and equivalent to the SSG Drill Sergeants in a number of areas including: respect for the trainee, ability to manage stress and handle volatile situations, and various gender integrated training issues.

Company Commanders, First Sergeants and Platoon Sergeants noted the SGTs' enthusiasm and ability to work with trainees, and voiced no concerns with their selection or abilities to handle the stress of the job. Battalion and Brigade level

personnel were also in complete support. Drill Sergeant Schools provided good training and high standards, and at each installation, reception and integration of the Sergeants was as for other new personnel; they were provided tools for success and supported and mentored throughout. The most noted concern expressed was on Sergeants limited experience, but in the Pilot Test, that did not translate to performance problems. Adherence to the Drill Sergeant selection criteria, including rated time in a leadership position, should ensure the high quality of personnel needed.

Utilization and Dissemination of Findings:

The interim results were provided to TRADOC DCSOPS&T in Nov 2004. Subsequently, the Commander, TRADOC, recommended to the Chief of Staff of the Army that a change be made to Army policy which prohibits Sergeants from serving as Drill Sergeants. In Feb 2005, the CSA directed that Sergeants be reinstated to Drill Sergeant duty.

SERGEANTS AS DRILL SERGEANTS: RETURNING SERGEANTS TO DRILL SERGEANT DUTY

CONTENTS

CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

CONTENTS (Continued)

Sergeants as Drill Sergeants: Returning Sergeants (E-5) to Drill Sergeant Duty

Introduction

In the fall of 1997, senior Army Leaders made a deliberate decision to limit Drill Sergeant (DS) assignments to personnel in the rank of Staff Sergeant (SSG) and Sergeant First Class (SFC). Exceptions were made for a few Military Occupational Specialties (MOSs), for women, and for some National Guard and Reserve units. Generally, Sergeants – E-5 (SGTs) were no longer eligible to serve as DSs. This strategy was implemented to ensure a high level of leadership experience and maturity for all serving as Drill Sergeants.

In the intervening years, several events suggested that the decision to preclude SGTs from serving as DS be revisited and rescinded. The DS Program and all of Initial Entry Training (IET) have been thoroughly examined, and many changes made in the training bases and the rules governing DSs and Drill Sergeant School. The overall focus provided by the Army Value Program has lead to a more smoothly running initial entry training process, better for the Trainees and for the DSs, and ultimately, for the Army.

In the fall of 2003, Headquarters, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) decided to authorize a study to readdress the issue of who could serve as a DS. The number of candidates available for Drill Sergeant School was becoming increasingly limited because many personnel otherwise qualified to be DSs were deployed in Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom. The pool of qualified SSGs and SFCs available to attend Drill Sergeant School was smaller than needed to fill the available slots in basic training units. In view of the successful performance of SGTs as Recruiters, and as team and squad leaders in recent combat operations, senior Army leaders were ready to consider a proposal to readmit SGTs to Drill Sergeant School and subsequent duty as DSs. (See text of Study Request, TRADOC (August 13, 2003) and Drill Sergeant Selection Memorandum, Appendix B.)

Overview of the Present Study

The Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Training (DCSOPS&T) at TRADOC proposed a three site proof-of-principle pilot study to determine the impacts and efficacy of readmitting SGTs to DS duty. The DCSOPS&T provided oversight for the study, with the U.S. Army Accessions Command (USAAC) responsible for execution of the test. The stated focus of the study was to determine:

- How well the SGTs handled stress and managed anger;
- The degree to which SGTs were effective DSs;
- How well the chain of command and more senior DSs coached, mentored, and lead the SGT DSs;

- How effective the selection process/criteria were in identifying/selecting qualified SGTs to be DSs.

The U.S. Army Research Institute (ARI) Infantry Forces Research Unit at Fort Benning, GA, with a contractor team from the Wexford Group International (WGI) and Alternative Healthcare Research, conducted this study. The ARI Team was comprised of three research psychologists, two retired Infantry officers and two retired senior non-commissioned officers (NCOs). Both NCOs had careers of over 30 years. One had specific experience as a DS; the other was a former Sergeant Major of the Army. Both officers had served at battalion (BN) and brigade (BDE) level, one as a battalion commander (BN CDR). Two psychologists had over 20 years experience in military research; the third had recent human factors engineering and statistical experience.

The TRADOC Study Sponsor (DCSOPS&T and USAAC) designated three IET sites for the study. Fort Jackson, SC was chosen as a gender integrated Basic Combat Training (BCT) site and Fort Benning, GA was selected as a male-only One Station Unit Training (OSUT) site. Fort Gordon, GA was designated a third site because DSs participate during a Soldier's Advanced Individual Training (AIT), in this instance, Signal Corps MOSs. The overall intent was to insert a limited number of SGTs into the Drill Sergeant Schools and then into select IET units.

Summary of the Approach

The study began in October 2003, three months before the first group of SGTs arrived at Drill Sergeant School in January 2004. The overall study plan consisted of several sequential and overlapping steps. Surveys were developed and administered and in-depth interviews were conducted with selected current and former DS to determine the most desirable characteristics and attributes of a DS. The criteria for selection for Drill Sergeant School were examined, followed by analysis conducted to determine how to measure success in performance of the job of DS.

Based on background interviews and survey data, WGI developed Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales (BARS) to permit objective measurement of DS performance during Drill Sergeant School and in the first unit of assignment. The BARS were administered to measure an individual's potential performance as a DS, and again several times during the DS's first unit of assignment to evaluate actual performance. Raters included Senior DSs, First Sergeants (1SGs), and Company Commanders (CO CDRs). Data from the Drill Sergeant School included academic records and Army Physical Fitness Test (APFT) scores. Onsite observations of DS training and performance during Drill Sergeant School and in the units occurred as appropriate and as possible. Additional interviews, formal and informal, were conducted with any personnel in contact with DS, to include the DSs themselves.

The overall schedule was as shown at Table 1, and more detailed information at Appendix C. Background work and development of the BARS were done at WGI facilities; face to face interviews and surveys took place at the Human Resources

Command (HRC), in IET units at Fort Benning, Fort Jackson, and Fort Gordon, and at the Drill Sergeant Schools at Fort Benning and Fort Jackson. Surveys were also given to Command Sergeants Major (CSMs) at the Sergeants Major Academy (USASMA) at Fort Bliss.

Table 1
Schedule of Events in the Drill Sergeant Study

Timeframe	Activity	Result
Oct–Dec 03	Background research	Write study plan; literature search; develop interview protocols; develop questionnaires for former DSs;
	Conduct initial interviews	Gain information on job of DS; key attributes
	Brief key leaders	Establish initial relationships at key installations including Forts Benning, Jackson, Gordon and HRC
	Begin development of BARS	Collect "critical incident" data through interviews and surveys at key installations
	Examine DS selection criteria	Develop demographic questionnaires; discuss criteria with HRC
Jan 04	Continue development of BARS	Administer DS surveys at SMA; refine BARS
Jan–Feb 04	Gather feedback on BARS	Give BARS to serving DSs and Drill Sergeant School personnel
	Plan for data collection	Refine questionnaires. Plan observations
Jan 04	Administer questionnaires at Nominative SM conference	Refine BARS based on feedback
	Refine and finalize BARS	Disseminate BARS for final approval
Jan-Aug 04	Brief and interview Chain of Command at DSS	Gain project buy-in from two Drill Sergeant School and DS Proponency Office
	Brief and interview Chain of Command in IET units	Provide background for Benning, Jackson and Gordon
Jan-Mar 04	Observe DSS training	Benning (1) class
Mar-Aug 04	Observe DSS training	Benning (2) and Jackson (2) classes
Mar, May, Aug 04	Administer modified BARS to assess DS potential	Obtain DSS demographics; peer and cadre evaluations on modified BARS (5) classes
Jan-Aug 04	Contact DSS	Gather DSS academic and APFT records
May-Aug 04	Observe DS performance during first cycle IET	Benning, Jackson, Gordon
	Talk formally and informally with DS chain of command	Benning, Jackson, Gordon
	Provide BARS	Get cadre ratings on Sergeant DSs
Nov 04	Preliminary findings to TRADOC sponsor	Interim Report
Jan – Mar 05	Observe DS second and third cycle; obtain BARS ratings	Benning, Jackson, Gordon
	Talk formally and informally with DS chain of command	Benning, Jackson, Gordon
Jun 05	Document findings	Final Study Report

There are three installations that conduct Drill Sergeant School (Forts Benning, Jackson, and Leonard Wood). All three provide gender integrated DS training, although there were only two women in training at Fort Benning during the study. The original plan included only Forts Benning and Jackson DS Candidates. After the study

was underway, the Study team was informed that SGTs who were in class in Drill Sergeant School at Leonard Wood would be added to the final population of DSs to be observed in their IET locations. The four Drill Sergeant School candidates from Fort Leonard Wood were identified too late to be a part of the original data collection and only IET unit BARS data are available on them.

Summary of the Findings

All data collected are ultimately potentially useful but in keeping with the original study request, primary focus was placed on how effective the selection process and criteria were in identifying and selecting qualified SGTs to be Drill Sergeants, how well the SGTs handled stress and managed anger, and how well the chain of command and more senior DSs coached, mentored, and lead the SGT DSs. The results of the analyses indicate that based on the selection process used, and on the observations made at Drill Sergeant School and during unit training, SGTs appear to be fully capable of being effective DSs. On some measures, the SSG DSs were rated higher than the SGT DS, but the differences were small and all of the SGT DS performances were rated as fully acceptable. Further, there were no systematic problems identified in the training and IET performance of the SGT DSs. The IET units mentor and coach all new DSs, regardless of rank, and did not feel a need to change procedures to accommodate the addition of SGTs. The study results consistently indicate that it would be appropriate to return SGTs to Drill Sergeant status.

Purpose of this Report

The overall purpose of this report is to document the results of the Sergeants as Drill Sergeants proof of principle study. The entire study extended over a period of slightly over 18 months. Specific steps in the methodology and results will be addressed in turn. Appendixes include an acronym list (Appendix A), and the original study request (Appendix B). The overall plan or approach, to include milestones and examples of primary interviewees is at Appendix C. Initial data from the questionnaires, surveys and interviews developed for the front end analysis of DS performance are at Appendixes D, E, F, and G. The Appendixes include the questionnaires and summaries of the results, as well as, where possible, demographics on the respondents. The BARS and the modified BARS (assessment of DS potential) are found at Appendixes H and I. Selected aspects of the course description for the Drill Sergeant School Program are in Appendix J. Demographic data on the Drill Sergeants are at Appendix K and their Drill Sergeant School performance is included at Appendix L. The results form the modified BARS are at Appendix M, and the results of the full BARS at Appendix N. An informal e-mail survey is shown in Appendix O. To maintain the anonymity and privacy of the personnel involved, all potentially identifying information has been removed.

Method

Participants

The original plan for the SGTs DS study proposed a focus on 90 Sergeant Drill Sergeants, 45 serving at Fort Jackson, 30 at Fort Benning, and 15 at Fort Gordon. According to branch chiefs from HRC and the NCO in charge (NCOIC) of the HRC Drill Sergeant Team, based on historical data, to get 90 SGTs on the ground as SGT DSs for the Pilot Study, the selection process needed to target 150 potential candidates. Due to various factors, including availability, deferments, and attrition, this original total number was not achieved and only 58 Active Duty SGTs were actually enrolled as candidates in Drill Sergeant School classes at Fort Benning and Fort Jackson between January and August 2004. This number included 28 at Fort Benning, in Classes 3-4 (January start), 5-6 (May), and 7-8 (June) and 30 at Fort Jackson in Classes 5-6 (May) and 7-8 (June). There were a total of four SGTs at Fort Leonard Wood in Classes 5-6 and 7-8; since they were not included in the initial plan, only limited IET unit data were available on them. From the original 62 SGTs enrolled as a part of the SGT pilot program (28 at Fort Benning, 30 at Fort Jackson, four at Fort Leonard Wood), only 50 actually served as DS following Drill Sergeant School. The reasons for this attrition will be detailed later.

Materials

There are no existing performance measures or criteria to tell how well a DS is performing on the job, or how well in relation to his or her peers. Both qualitative (surveys, focus groups, interviews, notes from observations) and quantitative (BARS, attrition, academic data) were developed for use in this study.

Demographic Surveys, Questionnaires and Interviews

Surveys and questionnaires are found at Appendixes D, E, F and G. Currently serving and prior DSs who participated in interviews or completed surveys as a part of the overall front end analysis were asked to provide demographics and a questionnaire was developed to query these prior DSs on aspects of Drill Sergeant School and on the job performance. A separate form was used to serve as the basis for structured interviews. Each of the separate instruments was designed to elicit the maximum amount of information about and from the respondent.

With each of the five Drill Sergeant School classes at Fort Benning and Fort Jackson, a demographic survey was administered to all the DS candidates in conjunction with the administration of modified BARS peer ratings (Appendix I). The intent of this demographic survey was to determine the ages, time in service, presence or absence of combat experience and volunteer or Department of the Army (DA) select status for all students, regardless of rank, in a particular Drill Sergeant School Class. The survey also helped determine to what extent the specific guidelines for Drill

Sergeant School selection were being followed. Candidates were also asked for their MOS, where they were going to serve as DSs, special skills, and, if they were willing to be contacted, their e-mail addresses. Cadre from Drill Sergeant School or IET units were also asked to complete these demographic forms as appropriate.

Attempts to Describe Drill Sergeant Performance

A number of studies and publications provided specific background for the effort to measure DS behaviors. As a part of an ARI project entitled NCO21, related studies defined knowledge, skills and attributes needed by NCOs for promotion (Campbell, Knapp, & Heffner, 2002; Knapp, Heffner, & Campbell, 2003). These authors developed and validated a set of 19 rating scales for assessing NCO performance (Knapp, Heffner, & Campbell, 2003). In their instrument, called BARS, each question is anchored by a description of potentially acceptable and unacceptable behaviors describing the specific attribute being measured; raters mark a seven or nine point scale to indicate where the person being rated falls on behaviors related to that dimension.

Other studies were examined as part of the front end analysis of DSs and their desired attributes, traits and behaviors to determine the general foundations for BARS. TRADOC PAM 525-66 *Military Operations (Force Operating Capabilities)* (TRADOC, 2003) says that leaders must have excellent leadership and critical thinking skills as well as tactical and technical expertise. In a study of Company Commanders, Matthews and Dyer (1999) also described effective leadership capabilities: organizational and interpersonal skills, decision making, military expertise, and professionalism. They noted that the enthusiasm and motivation of junior officers was a key element of a commander's success.

Part of the decision on when to administer the BARS came from a study by Zazanis and Lappin (1998). In the attempt to predict performance in the Special Forces Assessment and Selection program, they measured persistence, tactical and leadership performance, social interactions and physical performance. When they looked at peer assessments and training cadre ratings, they found that peer evaluations tended to predict performance, and included more information about interpersonal skills than did supervisory ratings.

Development of Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales for the Drill Sergeant Study

A format very similar to that employed for the NCO21 scales (Knapp, Heffner, & Campbell, 2003) was used to develop the SGT DS Study Performance Measures. Some of the NCO21 scales were actually included in the DS Performance Measures with only slight wording changes to make them more appropriate for the IET environment. Other stems (e.g., *How effective will this DS be in demonstrating understanding of diverse cultural and social backgrounds?*) were newly developed based on regulatory guidance, IET policies and procedures, and problems and examples provided in WGI's interviews with serving and former DS. The attempt to

develop and then use such a measure (the BARS) required several steps, all very important.

Background for BARS. The BARS development was sequenced in phases, starting with written and oral interviews and questions posed to serving and former DSs as well as to personnel from the HRC (Appendix F). The process provided the respondents opportunity for both structured and semi-structured comments. During these interviews and surveys, questions were asked about examples of common DS mistakes, and examples of exceptionally good and exceptionally poor DS performance. Respondents were asked what aspects of Drill Sergeant School and the DS experience were most and least helpful in preparing them for their jobs. They were queried as to the methods that might be useful in assessing DS performance, and the dimensions on which these measures should be based. The primary question to be answered was how well SGT Drill Sergeants performed on the job (a) relative to other DSs and (b) according to different observers. Both current and former DSs responded to surveys of this nature; others responded to similar surveys given to personnel attending the Nominative Sergeants Major Conference in January 2004. (See Appendix D for surveys and interviews.)

This preliminary front end analysis work produced a great deal of consensus on the skills, attributes, attitudes and characteristic behaviors desired of DSs. There were also suggestions on the selection process, Drill Sergeant Schools, and on-the-job performance. Given this background, a means to measure the degree to which DSs performed in congruence with these expectations could be developed. As prototype instruments were developed, current and former DSs and those who have supervised DSs were again tapped to provide assistance in modification and refinement of the measurement instrument. Besides responding to questions (written, face-to-face, or telephonic), interviewees reviewed the behaviors described on prototype BARS surveys. Thinking of the performance of the best and worst DS they knew, they were asked to think about the behavior that merited the category, describe the situation that triggered it, and how the DS handled the situation, wrongly or rightly. These vignettes, labeled critical incident reports, were used as the basis for generating BARS and modifying the initial instruments.

Prototype BARS scales were sent to DSs and DS Cadre from Fort Benning, Jackson, Gordon and Leonard Wood for their comments. Three 2004 Drill Sergeants of the Year (TRADOC and Fort Gordon) were asked for their feedback, as were many current and former DS, including those who were among the initial interviewees and including many in the chains of command at Forts Benning, Jackson and Gordon. Based on their comments and suggestions, the scales were modified several times to ensure optimum wording, etc. The intent of the continuous refinement was to ensure the scales captured the "essence" of being a DS, using terms familiar to and acceptable to DSs.

The final BARS represented an attempt, through descriptions of specific incidents, to provide behaviorally anchored stems to illustrate superior and inferior DS

behavior on a number of select dimensions. The intent was to help standardize evaluations and to codify and describe DS behavior, both acceptable and less than desirable. The BARS provide a criterion method for 1SGs, CO CDRs and Senior DS or Platoon Sergeants (PSGs) to rate serving DS on the behaviors and attributes determined to be related to successful DS performance. As noted, the scales, briefly described here, were based on the rating scales successfully used in other research (e.g., Knapp, Heffner, & Campbell, 2003) but defined and refined for this study by DSs during interviews and focus groups.

The BARS instrument. After several iterations and considerable feedback from multiple sources, the BARS instrument was finalized; versions are found at Appendix H and Appendix I. The BARS provide a standardized approach to behavioral ratings. Both positive and less than positive descriptions of Drill Sergeant behavior are included as a guideline. The basic format is as shown at Table 2.

Table 2
Extract from BARS Rating Scales

How effectively does this Drill Sergeant correct Trainee performance?		
Resorts to yelling and berating Trainees when their attention wanders or they fail to perform correctly.	Seldom resorts to berating Trainees, but does not always adjust voice for maximum effect.	Corrections are clear and authoritative. Modulates voice for maximum effect.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
To what extent does this Drill Sergeant teach, coach and mentor Trainees?		
Fails to coach or mentor Trainees who are having problems; does not provide useful feedback to improve performance.	Generally tries to coach or mentor Trainees who are having problems; provides feedback to improve performance but it is not always helpful.	Always takes a coaching or mentoring approach with Trainees who are having problems; provides helpful, specific performance feedback.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
To what extent does this Drill Sergeant motivate Trainees?		
Relies on punishment or threats to influence Trainee behavior; yells/curses at Trainees when they fail to meet standards; uses mass punishment for individual infractions.	Occasionally resorts to yelling at Trainees; has a repertoire of several kinds of disciplinary actions in addition to simply dropping Trainees for push-ups.	Recognizes effort as well as accomplishments; creative in designing corrective actions that are relevant to the infraction and creates true learning opportunities.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9

The phrases in the boxes are not intended to be full descriptions of that level of performance but to orient the rater, get him or her thinking about the standards for that performance area and what they have actually seen or heard the rated DS do. The

more the rater bases the rating on recollections of specific behaviors, the less room there is for bias and error in the rating. This format asks the rater to consider *several* aspects of performance in that area (the phrases are just prompts) and then *combine* them into an overall rating. The nine point scale permits degrees of agreement, from low to high.

The IET unit performance version of the BARS contains 32 items, covering the broad areas of Knowledge of Program of Instruction (POI) and IET Philosophy; the DS as a Role Model; and Attitude toward DS Duty and Peers (Appendix H). The modified BARS, used as a measure of potential at the end of Drill Sergeant School, contains 28 items (Appendix I). Most of these are identical to the items in the full BARS.

Although no attempt was made to measure either reliability or validity of these scales, there was considerable face validity, and the acceptance by former and current DSs was very high. Specific areas of the BARS are discussed later in the section covering use of the BARS in IET units.

Design and Procedures

The data collection plan focused on the job of DS, the selection process, Drill Sergeant School and DS On-the-Job Training, followed by DS On-the-Job Performance. To determine DS effectiveness, the first step of the study was a front end analysis of the job of DS. Selection issues could be determined by inspection of the Army Regulations and any exceptions made to permit Sergeants to serve, as well as by examination of Drill Sergeant School attrition data. Stress and anger management could only be determined by reports from peers or senior personnel on site in the unit, or possibly, in Drill Sergeant School. Similarly, issues about mentoring and the chain of command could only be determined in the IET unit. Each of these areas is briefly addressed.

Interviews and Surveys for Serving and Prior Drill Sergeants

As noted, as a part of the front end analysis of the issues, and to elicit information about the job of DS and the qualities desired of a serving DS, interviews, focus groups and surveys were conducted (See Appendix B for examples of personnel interviewed and Appendixes D through G for initial protocols and surveys). There were fourteen in-depth individual interviews with Branch Chiefs at the HRC and with seven incumbent DSs at Fort Benning, Fort Jackson, and Fort Gordon. Selected former DSs, personnel from the IET Chain of Command at Fort Benning, Fort Jackson and Fort Gordon, and personnel from the DS Proponency Office at Fort Jackson were interviewed as well. They were asked about their personal experiences, both positive and negative, as DSs or with DSs. They were asked to describe the qualities of a good DS and the attributes of any who failed to meet the standard. Part of the interview protocol included the critical incident approach employed to elicit examples of DS attributes used as a basis for unit ratings on performance.

A survey was also administered to 95 former and incumbent DS, to discern their attitudes toward some aspects of Drill Sergeant School and DS duty. They also provided examples of good and poor DS behaviors, and were asked to comment on the selection process, to include the potential use of SGTs as Drill Sergeants (Appendix E). Additional interviews and surveys were designed for Senior NCOs and CSMs to get a broader perspective. Data were gathered from the voluntary survey provided to attendees at the Nominative Sergeants Major Conference held at Fort Bliss in January 2004 (Appendix D). The 62 CSMs responding also provided behavioral examples of effective and ineffective performance through detailing good and bad examples of DSs they had encountered.

Selection for Drill Sergeant School

Army Regulation (AR) 614-200 (DA, 2003) *Enlisted Assignment and Utilization Management*, Chapter 8, Section III, Para 8-15 details overall eligibility criteria for the DS program. To be eligible to become a DS Candidate, all NCOs must meet the outlined prerequisites. The nominating Career Branch assesses a candidate's eligibility based on the list of key criteria.

Drill Sergeant selection criteria - AR 614-200. Candidates must be SSG or SFC, with a GT (General Technical) score of 100 or higher, waiverable to 90. They must meet a minimum physical profile, be able to pass the APFT, and be no older than 36 years old. They must meet the height/weight criteria of AR 600-9, the Army Weight Control Program (DA, 1987), and display good military bearing with no speech impediments. They must have a high school or general equivalency diploma (GED), have completed the Basic NCO Course (BNCOC) and a minimum of 4 years service with demonstrated leadership ability (AR 614-200 (DA, 2003)).

Personnel selected as DS Candidates must demonstrate potential for positions of increasing responsibility. Each candidate must have a commander's recommendation (Lieutenant Colonel or higher) which includes a mental health evaluation. According to the HRC personnel interviewed, the assessment is used to determine the emotional stability of the NCO, and whether he/she would be able to perform DS duty. The commander must personally interview the NCO (this may not be delegated) to ensure prerequisites are met. The commander considers physical fitness, character and integrity as well as demonstrated leadership, ability and potential. The commander is also supposed to assess the Soldier's ability to perform in stressful situations.

Drill Sergeant disqualification criteria. There are several areas where a candidate might be disqualified from the selection process. Generally a candidate must have no record of Article 15 or other disciplinary action during the previous three years. Disqualification can result from Court Martial, letter(s) of indebtedness, financial problems, etc. Type I, Absolute Disqualifiers, includes moral turpitude (e.g., sexual harassment, rape, assault of subordinate, spouse or child). Type I Disqualifiers also include violation of the Army's policy on sexual activity with subordinate Soldiers,

fraternization, participation in extremist organizations or activities, etc. Type II Disqualifiers are Offense and Time Related Disqualifiers, committed within the previous five years, to include driving under the influence, assault, any drug offense, larceny, and theft.

Human Resources Command. Information from the NCO in charge (NCOIC) of the Drill Sergeant Team at HRC provided additional information about DS selection. The HRC DS selection team does not conduct the initial screening process; they provide DS requirements by MOS, gender, and location to the Career Branches who screen their population to fill the quota for each class. The assignment manager conducts the initial screen and selects candidates who meet the outlined criteria. After the Branch Chief or Sergeant Major (SGM) verifies that the NCO meets the prerequisites, the file is forwarded and further checked. If the NCO passes, school dates and assignments are scheduled, and names are submitted to the Enlisted Background Screening Section for a background check. Once the file is accepted, there is reasonable confidence that the candidate meets the prerequisites for entry to Drill Sergeant School. (Personal communication, NCOIC, Drill Sergeant Team, April 21, 2004.)

Attrition after selection for the program is due to either background screening or new information (e.g., profile, commander's checklist, or deployment notification). Once a Soldier is enrolled in Drill Sergeant School, he or she may be removed for arriving unqualified. This may be a failure to meet prerequisites, including body fat composition requirements, or failing the APFT. Within school attrition may also come from inability to achieve the academic standard as well as medical reasons, emergency leave, etc. A candidate can also be removed from Drill Sergeant School for failure to maintain standards of military appearance and bearing, as well as bad conduct and/or lack of professionalism, including driving under the influence or testing positive for drugs. Other policy infractions, violations of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), and overall lack of proper motivation, are dealt with on an individual basis. According to HRC, and based on historical data, from the time an NCO is placed on assignment instructions to the time he or she becomes a DS, there is a presumed 40% attrition rate due to inability to meet the stated criteria. That is, nearly half of those originally named as potential DS candidates are refused. Selection standards are high (Personal communication, NCOIC, Drill Sergeant Team, April 21, 2004).

Special criteria used in selection for the pilot program. For the Sergeant SGT DS Pilot, the 2 October 2003 instructions to the Branches were to provide a limited number of SGTs to attend Drill Sergeant School and then to serve at Forts Benning, Jackson, and Gordon. (Memorandum for Chiefs, Combat Arms, Combat Support and Combat Service Support, SUBJECT: Drill Sergeant Quota for the SGT Pilot Program, TAPC-EPK-ID (614-200) 2 October 2003.) The nominated NCOs were to meet the prerequisites outlined in AR 614-200 (DA, 2003) with the following exceptions:

- Primary Leadership Development Course (PLDC) graduate (*not BNCOC*)
- one year time in grade with minimum of *one* year leadership time
- minimum *non-waiverable* GT score of 100.

The Drill Sergeant Application/Nomination Worksheet had to be signed by the Branch Chief or Branch SGM; as with all DSs, unfavorable information on the background check would automatically disqualify the NCO from entry into the Pilot Program and subsequent DS duty. In sum, the requirements for the SGTs were very similar to those of SSGs and SFCs; the job of Drill Sergeant is always highly selective.

The Drill Sergeant School Course of Study

According to the DS Proponency Office at Fort Jackson and the Drill Sergeant Schools at Fort Jackson and Fort Benning, no changes were made to the January 2004 POI to accommodate the SGTs. Other recent changes to the Drill Sergeant School POI (Rogers 2004a, b) are as a result of TRADOC policy changes that incorporate Warrior Tasks and Battle Drills and the focus on Warrior Ethos. Although some aspects of these changes had been provided during the calendar year 2004, they did not impact the Pilot Program.

The stated mission of Drill Sergeant School is to prepare highly qualified NCOs for DS duty (http://www.infantry.army.mil/DrillSgt/ or http://www.jackson.army.mil/dss). Graduates receive the "X" skill qualification identifier. Except during mobilization, schools conduct two classes simultaneously, with ten classes in a fiscal year. Each class has a maximum of 65 candidates. Drill Sergeant School includes both men and women at each location although the number of women attending Drill Sergeant School at Fort Benning tends to be small. The Course has a nine hour academic training day in addition to physical training (PT), five days a week for nine weeks. It includes small group instruction, inspections, after action reviews (AARs), and performance counseling. (Appendix J further defines the content of the Drill Sergeant School POI; an overview is provided here).

Within the POI, there are seven written examinations, eight oral modules, and six performance evaluations. To graduate, candidates must pass all performance examinations, and pass the APFT with 210 points (minimum 70 in each event), a standard slightly higher than the Army-wide minimum standard of 180 (60 points per event). Candidates must hold one leadership position within the class time and lead two PT sessions. An additional requirement is to negotiate the hand grenade qualification course, plus the throwing of two live grenades. Candidates must also execute conditioning and confidence obstacle courses.

The course is sequenced according to the three phases of IET. More information on IET can be found at http://www.benning.army.mil/bctb/ but generally the three phases focus on Soldierization (Phase I), basic skills (Phase II), and advanced combat skills (culminating field training exercise) (Phase III). The first three weeks of Drill Sergeant School (Phase I) include TRADOC Regulation 350-6 *Enlisted Initial Entry Training (IET) Policies and Administration* (TRADOC, 2003), discipline, attention to

detail, and professional conduct. Classes cover Army Values and Warrior Ethos, human relations, gender integrated training, and counseling, and Drill and Ceremonies. Additionally, DS candidates conduct and pass daily inspections, improve physical fitness, and complete academic requirements.

During the second three weeks (Phase II), DS candidates demonstrate proficiency in training fundamentals of marksmanship, and continue to work on fitness and academics. The final three weeks (Phase III) sustain the previous six. They provide supervised inspections, fitness, human relations development and understanding of gender integrated training. In Phase III candidates become proficient with hand grenades, conduct tactical training and complete the remainder of the POI requirements. DS Candidates must pass with scores of 70% or greater, with up to two retests.

Data Collection during Drill Sergeant School January – August 2004

The first class with SGTs on the roster was the January – March Class 3-4 at Fort Benning. In March and again in June, both Fort Benning and Fort Jackson had SGTs present in Drill Sergeant School Classes 5-6 and 7-8 along with the SSGs and SFCs, for a total of five classes for whom academic data were available. (Fort Leonard Wood Drill Sergeant School had four SGTs, in March and May, and although those Sergeants are included in the final number in the program, their in-school data were not available to the WGI team.) The data collection instruments were given to all candidates - SGTs, SSGs and SFCs, to provide a basis of comparison.

Demographic data and academic performance. The demographic surveys (Appendix K) at both Fort Jackson and Fort Benning provided DS Candidates' backgrounds, including age, time in service, MOSs, etc. School data were provided by the Drill Sergeant Schools (Appendix L). The schools provided student performance on the eight separate aspects of Drill Sergeant School academic subjects (Leadership, Counseling, Introduction to Drill and Ceremony, Manual of Arms, Drill Terms, General Subjects, TRADOC Regulation 350-6, and Standard PT) and on the candidates' overall averages and ranks within their classes. The APFT scores were also provided. In the event of within class attrition, the School generally provided the reason for failure. All of these items helped comprise the larger data base, and provided a good picture of the DS candidates.

Administration of the modified BARS at Drill Sergeant School. Partially based on Zazanis and Lappin's (1998) findings that peer ratings provide considerable insight, a decision was made to have Drill Sergeant School candidates and School Cadre rate the candidates on their *potential* performance as DSs. Ratings were to be based on impressions of the candidates during school; the rating was made just before the end of Drill Sergeant School when the candidates and cadre had been together for nine weeks. To obtain assessments of potential performance, the candidates rated both themselves and their squad members. Two cadre from each Drill Sergeant School Platoon also rated each candidate. The scale used to provide in-school ratings was

based on the BARS scale, but in the interests of time, slightly abbreviated in format and number of questions included. Sample questions are shown at Table 3; the entire modified BARS is found in Appendix I.

The intent of the modified BARS was primarily to see if DSs and DS Cadre could use the scale. The first use of the modified BARS was after the first Drill Sergeant School class at Fort Benning; since it was successful, the procedure was repeated for the other four Benning and Jackson classes in the study. The modified 28 item scale was given to all candidates, SGT, SSG, and SFC, in each of the five Drill Sergeant School classes although there were some missing data due to DS Candidate absences.

Table 3
Modified BARS

How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in following and enforcing IET policies, rules and regulations?								
MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in setting a professional example with respect to physical fitness?								
MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in managing stress?								
MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Training observations. On several occasions at each installation, WGI personnel attended Drill Sergeant School training. Some portions of the training observed were classes held as a part of the Drill Sergeant School curriculum; other observations were at times when the Drill Sergeant School candidates were themselves observing training during OSUT or BCT classes. Depending on the circumstances, personnel within the Drill Sergeant School cadre chain of command and selected DSs were interviewed informally as they waited for training to begin or during breaks. Time was also spent with Drill Sergeant School 1SGs, Operations SGTs and CO CDRs to discuss Drill Sergeant School in general and the SGTs as DSs program in particular. Several in depth structured interviews were conducted as well with individuals who had considerable experience with the DS Program.

E-mail to Drill Sergeant School graduates. As a part of the demographic questionnaire completed in Drill Sergeant School, candidates were given the option of providing e-mail addresses if they were willing to be contacted later. Not everyone provided an e-mail address. Although many had agreed, some of the addresses provided were no longer viable when the survey was sent out. Messages were sent to approximately 100 DSs after they had graduated, including all of the SGT graduates. The questions were fairly general, concentrating on their reception and integration into their units, and asking for any feedback from their Drill Sergeant School experience (Appendix O).

Data Collection During Unit (IET) Training June 2004 – March 2005

Interviews and focus groups. The original intent was to conduct several focus groups with Soldiers at the three locations. However, this proved very difficult; as per TRADOC Sponsor guidance, there was no more than one SGT in any one platoon, and generally very few in any company. (See Study Request at Appendix B.) Different training schedules made combined groups difficult to assemble, even over the lunch hour. For example, in one focus group setting, not all those scheduled to participate actually arrived, and one had to leave early. Individual opportunities for interviews with DSs in the program were taken as possible and several maintained an e-mail contact.

Interviews with BDE CDRs and BDE CSMs were both formal and informal at all three IET locations. Because of the need to coordinate for visits to the units and to training venues, after the initial formal interviews in the early months of the study, the meetings with the CSMs tended to be informal, frequent and spontaneous. Meetings with BDE CDRs were less frequent. There were also e-mail exchanges with several Brigade level personnel at each installation. Similarly, it proved very efficient to take advantage of opportunities to meet with BN CDRs and their CSMs during training observations and as occasions presented in the Garrison environment. CO CDRs, their 1SGs and Senior DSs were also approached at their convenience; although some formal and group interviews were conducted, most were during the course of training. Time considerations frequently impacted on the ability to cover all but the most critical areas. Commanders tended to offer unsolicited opinions on the program; their (few) concerns; and to praise their Drill Sergeants.

Observations of unit (IET) training. At Forts Benning and Jackson it was possible to watch some of the SGT DSs during the day as they were in charge of Trainees. This was especially likely if Trainees were on ranges or at the Teamwork Development Course or other outdoor events. Watching the DS in action and often talking with his or her Trainees on the spot, provided additional information. The DS role in the AIT environment at Fort Gordon is very different from the DS role at Fort Jackson or Fort Benning. At Fort Gordon, DSs are primarily used for movement and garrison duties; they serve as Assistant Instructors during MOS training rather than as Primary Instructor. Most data on Fort Gordon DSs came from the 1SGs and CO CDRs.

Administration of the BARS in (IET) units. The 32 item BARS, with full descriptors and the nine point scales, was given at each of the three IET locations (Appendix H). The BARS was intended for multiple iterations of ratings, with several raters each time. Each DS was to be rated by the CO CDR, the CO 1SG, and the Senior DS or PSG, thereby providing three ratings per Soldier at each rating period. In practice, however, not everyone who was supposed to complete a BARS scale actually did so. The actual numbers varied, depending on the unit, the location, and the specific time the DS or rater arrived at the unit. Additionally, although the intent was to have the same rater over time, the realities of Army assignments and reassignments sometimes precluded this; raters changed. Although the primary focus was on SGT DSs, a limited number of ratings were also obtained for some SSGs who had attended Drill Sergeant

School with the SGTs, to have a population with comparable time in position with whom to compare the SGTs.

Results and Discussion

While the entire study encompassed data collection from three IET installations, plus HRC and the SMA interviews, the principal analyses are focused on the 278 Active Duty Drill Sergeant School graduates (SGT, SSG, and SFC) from five classes at Forts Benning and Jackson who went onto IET training. Given the long time span covered, there were, inevitably, some missing data; however, the bulk of the data collection occurred as planned. The Appendixes to this report contain summarized data and the instruments; highlights are presented in the next few sections of the body of the report, organized generally in the sequence in which the data were gathered. Data from varying sources are combined unless there is a reason for separating them; generally there was agreement about each of the subjects addressed. Interim results and briefings were presented to the sponsors; there have been no real changes since then (Salter, Klein & Graham, 2004).

Serving Drill Sergeants

Of the SGTs who entered Drill Sergeant School at Forts Benning, Jackson and Leonard Wood, 54 actually graduated and 50 went to their designated units. Three Sergeants (one from Fort Jackson, two from Fort Benning) who graduated were returned to their units for immediate deployment; one other (Fort Jackson) was temporarily deferred for medical reasons. Thirty-one SGTs began duty as BCT DSs at Fort Jackson, 14 went to OSUT at Fort Benning, and five to AIT at Fort Gordon (see Table 4). These 50 constitute the final Soldier sample. Demographic data and academic averages, etc., have been adjusted to include only the serving Sergeants; some Fort Benning and Fort Jackson data are missing; as noted earlier, few data are available for Fort Leonard Wood graduates.

Table 4
Drill Sergeant IET Locations

Graduated from	Assigned to	Graduated	Deferred	Serving
Benning	Benning	16	2	14
Benning	Jackson	4		4
Jackson	Jackson	26	2	24
Jackson	Gordon	4		4
Leonard Wood	Jackson	3		3
Leonard Wood	Gordon	1		1
Total		54	4	50

Drill Sergeant School Attrition

Data were collected on graduation rate, and where possible, the reasons for failure. During the five Benning and Jackson classes studied there was some limited, and according to DS Cadre, not unusual, attrition. Most failures come from inability to achieve the height-weight body fat standard, failure to pass the APFT or some part of the Academic Standard for Drill Sergeant School Modules. Losses sometimes occurred due to emergency leave or medical deferments; there are always an occasional few whose behavior indicates a lack of motivation. All candidates must have passed background checks before arrival; rarely, disqualifying information is found after the candidate arrives at School. In this event, the candidate is dismissed.

After considerable discussion, a decision was made not to include Reserve Component Sergeants in the sample; therefore all data for the Reserve Component Sergeant DS Candidates were removed. To the extent possible, data for the SSGs and SFCs have been adjusted to remove these Soldiers as well. However, due to missing data and inconsistencies in the way the Drill Sergeant School reported their data, this may not have been successful and some totals for the SSGs and SFCs may appear slightly different.

Fort Jackson showed no SGT attrition; Fort Benning had nine SGT failures. However, the success rate of SGTs in Drill Sergeant School was comparable to other ranks with graduation rates of 86%, 87%, and 86% for SGT, SSG, and SFC, respectively. The totals are as shown at Table 5. Several SGTs from Fort Benning, mostly from Class 3-4 in January, did not meet the height/weight standard and were removed from the program. One was dropped for failure to pass a Module; two were released for disciplinary reasons. According to Drill Sergeant School personnel, one of these had prior disciplinary problems and under the criteria, should not have been selected for Drill Sergeant School. No SGTs from Fort Jackson were removed from the program although there was some SSG attrition in Class 7-8.

Table 5
Drill Sergeant School Enrollment and Attrition (Benning and Jackson only)

	Benning 3-4		**Benning 5-6**		**Benning 7-8**		**Jackson 5-6**		**Jackson 7-8**		**Total grads**	
	Start	End	Start	End	Start	End	Start	End	Start	End	Start	End
SFC	2	0	6	5	0	0	4	4	9	9	21	18
SSG	53	43	40	33	57	50	33	33	59	51	242	210
SGT	15	8	10	10	3	2	24	24	6	6	58	50
N	70	51	56	48	60	52	61	61	74	66	321	278

Note. Graduation data for SSGs and SFCs (only) may include Reserve Component candidates.

Desired Qualifications

There do not appear to be any changes required in the original qualification criteria as postulated by the TRADOC sponsor and articulated by HRC. Many of the SGTs selected for the program were already promotable to SSG, or quickly became

promotable; both factors are seen as validation of the selection criteria. Just one year after the first group of SGTs graduated, 38 of the 50 serving (76%) had been promoted to SSG. Of the remainder, at least 6 more are known to be promotable. For the 46 SGTs serving in the Pilot Program for whom demographic data are available, the SGTs averaged 7 years in service. In comparison, the 206 SSGs in the same classes had 11 years time in service; the 14 SFCs had 14 years in service. The SGTs averaged 28 years of age; the SSGs were 32 years old and the SFCs were 34.years of age. Although the average age for the SGTs was younger than the others, the range was 22 to 38, effectively refuting the statement that Sergeants are too young, or too close in age to recruits to be effective. (Demographic data are at Appendix K.)

To be considered for selection for the pilot program, GT scores were held at minimally 100, without waiver, and PLDC was required. No specific time in service or time in grade requirement was specified. The original plan suggested that operational experience (Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, Kuwait, Iraq) was desirable. Over all classes, all ranks, most Soldiers for whom data are available reported some combat experience: 27 SGTs (60%), 144 SSGs (70%) and 12 (83%) of the SFCs reported themselves as combat veterans. The relevance of this experience to successful DS performance is unknown. However, since almost all personnel interviewed mentioned maturity as a significant aspect of DS performance, whatever unquantifiable experience and maturity comes from combat is presumed to be helpful.

During the initial interviews, and since then, there have been questions about the effects of volunteer status. The benefits of Volunteers versus DA select candidates are unknown. In the five Drill Sergeant School classes surveyed, there were only four SGT volunteers (9%), 64 SSG volunteers (31%) and four SFC (29%) volunteers. It is possible that the DA select to Volunteer ratio may be atypical for these classes in view of the attempt to deliberately insert SGTs into the classes; additionally some did not answer the question. Few SGTs had the opportunity to volunteer as their records were specially screened for the program and they were, in effect, DA selected.

School Academic Data and APFT Performance

The data collection also provided student academic and APFT scores for Fort Jackson and Fort Benning. These data show the extent to which SGTs are academically and physically prepared to be DSs. Because the intent was to describe the SGTs in relation to the SSGs and SFCs, data were obtained on all ranks. Table 6 provides means; full data are at Appendix L. Although there are missing data, trends are clear. There were no obvious differences between the ranks. Only in the Manual of Arms module did SGTs score lower than the others. Usually they scored higher than the SFCs and the leadership average was higher than either of the other two. Similarly, the APFT scores for SGTs were like those of the other ranks.

Table 6
DSS Academic Results (Means) (Fort Jackson and Fort Benning only)

	Serving SGTs	ALL SSGs	ALL SFCs
Number	46	206	14
Intro to Drill & Ceremony	91.50	91.49	87.14
Leadership	84.28	81.36	81.82
Counseling	81.95	83.16	81.75
Manual of Arms	88.76	91.96	92.43
Drill Terms	86.76	87.41	86.14
TRADOC 350-6	94.72	94.43	94.34
General Subjects	79.89	79.42	78.53
Average Score	87.52	87.04	86.02
Final APFT	261.91	262.70	261.93

Peer and Cadre BARS Ratings during Drill Sergeant School

As described earlier, the modified BARS were given to the five Drill Sergeant School classes at Fort Jackson and Fort Benning to measure the candidate's perceived potential as a DS. For each individual rated, the means were computed for each item in the BARS across all the peer ratings. Similarly, cadre ratings were averaged for each DS candidate. The way the scales were designed, both Moderate and High are acceptable responses. Table 7 shows the mean ratings for each rank, the highest and lowest scores, and the number and percentage of candidates rated as having moderate (4-6) and high (7-9) potential. (No candidates were rated in the 1-3 range, only minimally acceptable.) Inspection shows little difference between the three ranks although some candidates are perceived as having higher potential than others.

Table 7
Peer Ratings of Squad Member Potential (Means) (Benning and Jackson)

Rated	N	Mean Rank	Highest Rank	Lowest Rank	Moderate (4-6)	%	High (7-9)	%
SGT	46	7.37	8.71	4.69	14	30	32	70
SSG	204	7.45	8.92	4.75	46	23	157	77
SFC	14	7.16	8.49	5.93	5	36	9	64

Overall, the BARS peer ratings for potential are similar for all ranks of DS candidates and pairwise t-tests found no statistically significant differences between the three ranks. Verbal comments by DS Candidates while the BARS scale was being administered revealed some natural deference to those of higher rank. It is possible that the rank itself, rather than the candidate, may have influenced the rating. Additionally, since the ratings were done in a group setting, there may have been implied pressure to provide socially acceptable ratings.

Table 8 shows cadre ratings of student potential. There were several instances where cadre failed to return BARS forms, accounting for the unequal numbers of Drill Sergeant School candidates. The ratings for SGTs were not significantly different from those for SSGs, but the SFCs were rated significantly higher than both the SGTs ($t = 4.164$, $P<.05$) and the SSGs ($t = 3.64$ $P<.05$).

Table 8
Cadre Ratings of Candidate Potential

Rated	N	Mean Rank	Highest Rank	Lowest Rank	Moderate (4-6)	%	High (7-9)	%
SGT	40	7.20	9.0	5.32	19	48	21	52
SSG	199	7.47	9.0	4.99	44	22	155	78
SFC	13	8.11	9.0	7.48	0	0	13	100

That the SFCs were rated higher than both of the other two groups was not surprising. The failure to find a significant difference between the SGTs and the SSGs speaks well for the SGTs' overall ability. Most importantly, however, none of the overall mean ratings (means across items and raters) for any of the groups were lower than four. The ratings indicate that *all* groups, including the SGTs, were rated by the cadre to have *acceptable* potential to perform as Drill Sergeants. In general, these ratings of potential are consistent with findings from on-site interviews and observations during training.

A few modified BARS questions are highlighted as particularly relevant to the intent of the study. (Full data are found in Appendix G.) Table 9 shows examples. The first set of responses (questions 2-9 below) covers the candidate's knowledge of the POI and the IET philosophy. The second group of responses (questions 11-17) addresses the DS as a role model and the final question (23) deals with the DS's attitude toward the job and peers.

Generally, the peer ratings favored the SSGs. The SGTs were frequently rated higher than the SFCs, or very close to the SFCs. Most of the SGTs were, when questioned, self-effacing, and deferential to those with more "experience." Anecdotal reports suggested that both the SGTs and SSGs were more "hard charging" and eager than the SFCs. This may have accounted for some of the rating differences.

However, the mean cadre ratings were generally higher for the SFCs than for the SSGs who were higher than the SGTs. Questioning of the cadre brought some comments that the SGTs would perform very well, but they are downgraded because they just don't have as much "experience" as the more senior personnel. Pressed for a definition of experience, the only responses focused on the "amount of time leading Soldiers." Time was further defined by the number of Soldiers supervised, and in what activity they were being lead.

More importantly, all of the candidates rated, regardless of rank, had individual rating averages of at least *moderate* potential. Additionally, within the target group of SGTs, although the average peer rating was 7.4, four (9%) had mean ratings

of 8 or higher; and only one had a mean of less than 5. For the SSGs, 47 (23%) scored means of 8 or higher; only two had mean ratings of less than 5. For the SFCs, two (22%) scored 8 or higher; none scored less than 5.

Table 9
Selected Cadre and Peer Ratings from BARS Potential Ratings (Means)

How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in ...

Knowledge of POI and IET Philosophy						
2. correcting Trainee performance?						
Peer	SGT= 51	7.16	SSG = 206	7.49	SFC = 15	7.17
Cadre	SGT = 44	7.06	SSG = 201	7.43	SFC = 14	7.50
6. encouraging Trainees during training?						
Peer	SGT= 51	7.29	SSG = 206	7.41	SFC = 15	7.13
Cadre	SGT = 44	7.20	SSG = 201	7.39	SFC = 14	7.96
7. coaching, teaching, and mentoring Trainees?						
Peer	SGT = 51	7.16	SSG = 206	7.42	SFC = 15	7.13
Cadre	SGT = 44	7.15	SSG = 201	7.41	SFC = 14	7.79
8. motivating Trainees?						
Peer	SGT = 51	7.13	SSG = 206	7.23	SFC = 15	6.96
Cadre	SGT= 44	7.08	SSG = 201	7.35	SFC = 14	7.96
9. demonstrating respect for the philosophy and mission of IET?						
Peer	SGT= 51	7.32	SSG = 206	7.44	SFC = 15	7.27
Cadre	SGT = 44	7.20	SSG = 201	7.47	SFC = 14	8.11
DS as a Role Model						
11. demonstrating behavior consistent with Army Values, and Warrior Ethos?						
Peer	SGT = 51	7.39	SSG = 206	7.58	SFC = 15	7.34
Cadre	SGT = 44	7.09	SSG = 201	7.62	SFC = 14	8.18
12. following and enforcing IET policies, rules and regulations?						
Peer	SGT = 51	7.54	SSG = 206	7.66	SFC = 15	7.57
Cadre	SGT = 44	7.22	SSG = 201	7.62	SFC = 14	8.54
16. managing stress?						
Peer	SGT = 51	6.91	SSG = 206	7.17	SFC = 15	6.92
Cadre	SGT = 44	6.67	SSG = 201	7.24	SFC = 14	7.93
17. handling frustrating situations?						
Peer	SGT = 51	6.85	SSG = 206	7.11	SFC = 15	6.73
Cadre	SGT = 44	6.69	SSG = 201	7.25	SFC = 14	7.86
Attitude toward Job and Peers						
23. performing duties/responsibilities w/ persons of differing cultural/social backgrounds						
Peer	SGT = 51	7.66	SSG = 206	7.62	SFC = 15	7.46
Cadre	SGT = 44	7.34	SSG = 201	7.68	SFC = 14	8.18

For the cadre ratings, the SGT mean was 7.2, but eight (20%) scored 8 or higher, and three of these SGTs were rated a perfect 9 by the cadre. None were rated less than 5. The SSGs had 59 (30%) with 8 or higher, including 4 with perfect 9s. The SFCs had 5 (38%) higher than 8, and one was rated 9. No SFCs were rated below 7.

With respect to conclusions to be drawn from the modified BARS, these ratings show only that most candidates were considered to have the *potential* of performing acceptably as DS, validating the effects of Drill Sergeant School selection and the POI. The difference in ratings between peers and cadre may or may not indicate DS potential; Zazanis and Lappin (1998) might argue that the generally lower peer ratings are more nearly valid. No data can be provided to confirm or deny this suggestion. Interestingly, several Drill Sergeant School Cadre noted importance of the BARS scales beyond the actual ratings. Some commented on the fact that the BARS forced them to think about the candidates on some dimensions not usually addressed; others asked for and were granted permission to use the BARS as a part of their within-school counseling routine.

Unit (IET) Training

The 50 Pilot Program SGT DSs available and actually serving as DS were observed "on the trail" at Forts Benning, Jackson and Gordon. At Fort Benning, 14 Fort Benning SGT Drill Sergeant School graduates were assigned to the male only Infantry OSUT. At Fort Jackson's BCT, 24 Fort Jackson Drill Sergeant School graduates were serving as well as four from Fort Benning and three from Fort Leonard Wood. At Fort Gordon, the five serving SGTs had been trained either at Fort Leonard Wood (1) or at Fort Jackson (4). Data were intended to answer the primary question as to whether Sergeants can effectively perform the duties and meet the responsibilities of a Drill Sergeant.

Changes to accommodate SGTs. The policies, procedures, and attitudes with respect to training and support for new DS during their first cycle were generally the same at each installation regardless of the DS's rank, SGT or other than SGT. Fort Benning initially instituted a more frequently than usual counseling program to accommodate perceived needs of the SGTs in the first few months of their DS duty but otherwise, reception and integration was as usual. At each installation, new DSs are always provided back ups, mentors, shadow or turtle time – different names are used in different units. Never is a new Drill Sergeant, *regardless of rank*, simply left to serve alone. Much of the process of becoming a DS consists of on-the-job training, learning daily and installation-specific techniques that are not covered in Drill Sergeant School, and procedural details to facilitate the job.

Coaching and mentoring. The mentor, coach, and lead approach, used by senior Army leaders, instructors, SSGs and SFCs at Drill Sergeant School, continued in the IET units. Almost all of the interviews, at every level of the chain of command contained comments like, "We set them up for success, just like any other new Drill Sergeant." Sergeant adjustments to the unit training environment were observed as

being similar to their entry into any unit. Based on comments from all interviewed, the ARI team found that SGTs appear to do as well as their SSG peers, and there were some anecdotal reports that the SGTs were easier to deal with than the SSGs. Although there were exceptions, SGTs were said to be eager, and without biases

Actual mentoring of new DSs by more experienced peers was very difficult to quantify. Most mentoring is informal, although there is always a Senior DS (like a PSG) available to assist a new DS. Time for the ideal right-seat-ride, or leader check-ride, terms used to imply a full cycle of watching before actually doing, is simply not available. There is too much need to utilize the new DSs as trainers as soon as they get to the unit. Patterns of reception and integration are inconsistent and appear to be a function of when the new DS arrives at the unit and the unit's immediate DS need. Although a few days grace may be available for the DS in his or her first week, generally they are given the installation specific train up check ride, and then put to work in some capacity. Some have suggested that observation time at the assigned unit should occur prior to the candidate's being sent to Drill Sergeant School if at all possible; however despite the fact that it appears to make good sense, there are no data to support or deny this procedure. According to all interviewees, there is no need to change staffing, policies or procedures to ensure success of new SGT DSs because those procedures are already in place to ensure the success of SSG and SFC DSs. The DSs help each other as much as possible.

NCO Acceptance of SGTs. There was initially some concern by the TRADOC sponsors as to how the SGT DSs would be received by their new DS peers and by their school and unit superiors. However, with the exception of the ARI study personnel, few people seemed to know there was a Pilot Program, and most did not know who the SGT DSs in the program were. The Reserve Component has had SGTs serving as DSs for a number of years, and exceptions have frequently been made for female Soldiers, so the limited number of SGTs in the IET units was not perceived as anything remarkable. Additionally, although most of the Pilot Study personnel had been selected for Drill Sergeant School when they were Sergeants or Sergeants promotable, several candidates were promoted to SSG before they ever reported into school for training, and others were promoted during school or in the month after graduation before they actually reported to the unit. A number of others were promoted very soon after arrival at the training base; others were recommended for promotion shortly after their arrival at the unit, based on their performance. Although they were still technically part of the SGTs as DSs pilot program, they were, once promoted, completely indistinguishable from other SSGs. The units, their DS peers, and most importantly, the Trainees, accepted them as Drill Sergeants, and rank was of no consequence.

It became, in every aspect, very difficult to distinguish the Study's SGT DSs from the remainder of the DSs. Two anecdotes describe the extent to which blending occurred. One Fort Benning SGT DS reported that during his first weeks he had seen DSs from outside his own platoon only in the morning when they were all in PT uniforms. The first time a DS from another platoon saw him in his regular uniform he expressed surprise, and wondered if the SGT had recently been demoted; his status as

a SGT had not been apparent by his behavior. In another instance, a SGT was selected for Drill Sergeant School at Fort Benning, was promoted before his enrollment, then graduated, and reported to Fort Jackson as a SSG. Until WGI tried to get information about him, neither he nor his 1SG realized he was in a Pilot Program.

Sergeants Serving as Drill Sergeants

On-site interviews and observations of SGTs performing DS duties and responsibilities during their first few cycles at OSUT, BCT and AIT extended from August 2004 through March 2005. Interviews with BDE, BN and CO CDRs, CSMs, Executive Officers (XOs), 1SGs, and other unit staff were conducted as often as possible. Some personnel were interviewed only once; others very frequently. As a matter of courtesy, WGI always notified senior installation personnel in advance of observations at training locations; the leaders then made a point of coming to speak with the WGI team. Partial interviews and informal discussions thus complemented training observations.

Once in the unit, SFCs rapidly assume leader roles; SSGs and SGTs do much of the day to day work interacting with and teaching the Trainees. After the DS's first cycle, sharing of the load is based on skill sets, personality, and preferences, not on rank, although some personnel admitted that the new DSs (regardless of rank) tend to get more undesirable taskings. This was not based on rank, but "newness," and is by no means unique to IET units or DSs.

Just as all NCOs and officers are supposed to receive regular feedback and counseling on their job performance, DSs are counseled periodically, and, like all others, receive on the spot corrections as needed. In some instances, extra attention was given to the SGT DSs for the first several months, and they were counseled weekly instead of monthly. No criteria for evaluation were specially developed for the SGTs, nor, apparently, were any needed. Counseling, not unlike the usual NCO counseling and feedback, came from the PSG, a more senior DS, or the 1SG. Company CDRs and more senior personnel, as in any unit, intervened only if asked.

Stress and anger management. One of the key concerns expressed at the start of the Pilot Program was whether SGTs would be able to handle the stress of DS duty, and whether they could keep their emotions under control. Almost all DSs, regardless of rank, said being on DS status was stressful. They cited the long hours and time away from families, especially the time away from their children. But in the same sentence as they offered the complaint, they noted that the unit makes an effort to give people relief time, and that they watch each other to see who needs a break. The SGTs were no different from the others. The chain of command was also aware of the pressures of DS status, and most volunteered that they try to pay close attention to all their DSs.

No issues were cited as indicating the SGTs had any more difficulty with emotional control than the others; a few suggested that newly graduated from Drill

Sergeant School, the SGTs were more acutely aware of the rules and regulations than were more senior personnel. The BDE CSMs, cognizant of DSs of all ranks, were especially quick to say that the SGTs fared extremely well in comparison with their more senior peers.

Repeatedly, most of the senior leaders said that they had no issues with their SGTs, and that the SGTs had blended into the unit and were performing well. Some suggested that in fact, the SGTs were more energetic than some of the more senior DSs, and more nearly able to identify with the Trainees. Asked specifically about the performance of their SGTs DSs, the CDRs and CSMs (CO and BN) and 1SGs and Senior DSs commented, almost without exception, that *their* SGT DS was unusually good. In this Pilot Program, there was never more than one SGT per platoon, and usually only one in a company. The impact of a greater density of SGTs within a platoon cannot be determined from this study.

Interviewees said that the SGTs were working hard, and some said that because they appear to be younger, the privates tend to come to them with problems. "They identify with him, go to him." If the privates see the DS as close to them in age, they think he or she may be more likely to sympathize, or empathize. Interviewees noted that for the DSs, especially those just out of Drill Sergeant School, keeping distance is rarely a problem. Drill Sergeants are well informed and well trained.

Reception and integration. With respect to reception and integration of the SGTs in the program, both BN CDRs and their CSMs repeatedly commented, "We set them up for success." They stated that all new personnel are treated equally – they are part of the team and provided the tools they need to succeed. Sergeants are seen to be "sponges" – they are said to be "hungrier and have fewer preconceived ideas." Some suggested that the SGTs adjust quickly, with no bad attitudes about what kinds of work they are willing or not willing to do.

Reception and integration were topics in the very few responses received from the e-mail query of Fort Jackson and Fort Benning Drill Sergeant School graduates. Almost without exception the DS commented that he or she had been helped by the others in the unit, and that the transition was no different from going into any other unit. One DS said, "My reception and integration went very well. I had a very supportive chain of command and the Drill Sergeants helped tremendously with getting me prepared." Another commented, "The other DS's are giving me advice and direction on what i [*sic*] am lacking and getting me to the point i [*sic*] need to be." They especially mentioned the help they received from others in filling out administrative paper work. Reception and integration are critical pieces of acceptance into a unit; SGTs were treated like other new incoming personnel.

Gender integrated training. There were initially some concerns expressed about SGTs in gender integrated training venues. Some personnel, including one senior female NCO, suggested that DS duty might be difficult in a gender integrated environment for Infantrymen who had trained at Fort Benning in the male only

environment. Although most of the Fort Benning trainees stayed at Fort Benning, a number (all ranks) went to Fort Jackson and other locales, apparently without difficulty. Reports from CDRs and from 1SGs were that gender integrated training is not a problem for SGTs or any one else and the buddy system is used at all installations for IET. The Drill Sergeant School POI covers gender issues and fraternization; when queried, DSs said they had no concerns about men and women in IET training environments. One DS, clearly unfazed by the prospect of men and women training together, said that the commander "tries to separate males and females more than should be, which completely goes against gender integrated training." In fact, another male DS went so far as to ask how to gender integrate Fort Benning BCT so the privates could get used to working with women.

Combat experience. Another early issue was the relative merit of combat experience in a DS. Although the success of SGTs in Iraq and Afghanistan was cited as one of the reasons for the return of SGTs to DS status, this was not a factor in the Pilot Program selection process. Interviewed personnel rarely thought combat experience was important one way or the other; arguments could be made in either direction. Many of the Drill Sergeant School cadre and senior unit DSs and PSGs did not themselves have combat experience; in the next few years the question will become moot.

Maturity, experience and leadership. The only apprehensions voiced by anyone interviewed were on experience and maturity, and what was referred to as leadership time. The most consistent concern raised about SGTs is that "Sergeants have no experience." There was, however, little consensus as to what was meant by experience. It appears that the commander's evaluation and the performance criteria used to select the Soldier for promotion to SGT or selection for Drill Sergeant School would seem more relevant than amount of experience per se.

The optimal time in service/time in grade needed before selection for Drill Sergeant School is unknown; recommendations vary and are based on personal opinion only. The SGT DSs for whom data were available, the Benning and Jackson students, reported an average of seven years time in service, ranging from a low of four years to a high of 15 years. This overlapped with the average SSG (11 years) and SFC (14 years) time in service. Anecdotal data suggest that what the DS has done before Drill Sergeant School (jobs, tours of duty, number of Soldiers supervised) is more important than a set number of years in the Army.

There was also little consensus on how much time in what kind of position was required or desired, even though it was often cited as important. Most queried said that some rated time in a leader position would contribute to the experience needed of a DS but the specifics varied according to the MOS or branch of the person responding. No clear picture emerged. Some of the DSs were young, with little time in the Army, and little experience in leading Soldiers. The amount of experience was usually a function of the specific MOS. Some of the Combat Support or Combat Service Support MOS Soldiers had supervised only two or three personnel prior to DS attendance; the Infantry

DSs had been team or squad leaders in charge of three to eight personnel. Rates of promotion within specific MOSs were also considered to be important in assessing a SGT's experience.

A blanket statement that Sergeants are too "young" cannot be justified either. The average age of SSGs was 32 years, and of SFCs, 34 years. The SGT DSs for whom demographic data are available averaged 27 years, but the ages ranged from 22 to 38, with 11 aged 30 or older. The specific MOS of the Soldier appears to be more important to the age at which he or she is promoted than actual age or time in service; some MOSs are less densely populated than others, and promotion is slower.

BARS Ratings in the Units

The results of the interviews and observations were complemented by the full BARS performance measures shown in Appendix N. The BARS items addressed three general areas: Knowledge of POI and IET Philosophy; the Drill Sergeant as a Role Model; and Attitude toward Drill Sergeant Duty and Peers. Each of these broad areas was broken into specific areas including, for example, the DS's ability to manage emotions and stress; to effectively counsel, mentor and lead Trainees; to conduct AARs; to demonstrate field craft skills; and to establish and maintain professional relationships with trainees and peers.

Limitations of the Data. The intent was to have three personnel (the CDR, the 1SG and the PSG or Senior DS) rate each SGT at each of two or three or four (depending on graduation dates) separate times. The plan was to collect ratings at the end of the SGT's first full cycle, then return at the end of another cycle, and another, to get several ratings over time. This plan proved more difficult to execute than expected. Sergeants arrived at staggered times into the units, based on graduation dates, whether a move was involved, and on leave taken in route to the unit. Depending on the specific company and location, they arrived at the beginning or midway in a cycle.

At no time did all the raters complete all the ratings on all the SGTs; however, most Soldiers received at least two ratings per time period and all but two SGTs received ratings on at least two separate rating occasions. There were 154 different raters involved, performing 337 separate ratings on the 50 SGT DSs. For some SGTs, the same rater completed multiple ratings over different rating periods; for others, one or even two of the raters were different due to normal changes and due to some failure to return surveys.

As a comparison for the SGT DS, additional BARS ratings were received for SSG DSs. The intent was to receive ratings on DSs who had graduated from Drill Sergeant School at approximately the same time as the Pilot Program SGTs, thereby ensuring that SSG DSs had the same amount of DS time as the SGT DS. This did not happen. Some raters selected personnel from the targeted Drill Sergeant School classes; others did not. A total of 28 SSGs were rated; no demographic data were available on these SSGs, nor how long they had been Drill Sergeants. Given that the

SGT DSs were rated after only one or two cycles, it is likely that the rated SSG DSs had been DSs for a longer period of time.

Mean BARS ratings. Despite the limitations in the data and sampling, the overall results are consistent with the other findings. The complete set of BARS data are provided at Appendix N.

As can be seen in Table 10, SSG DSs were rated higher than the SGT DSs (t (55) = 3.289, P<.05). While this is a statistically significant difference, the mean differences are relatively small, .6 on a nine point scale. The mean value for both groups are in the "High" range, i.e., greater than "7." That is, the SGT DSs were rated high, and the SSG DSs were rated a little more highly. Similarly, note that the mean ratings for the SGT DSs were all either "Moderate" or "High" with 62% being in the "High" category. Given that the SSG DSs were seen as having more experience, this small difference in rated performance is not surprising, and indeed expected. Also as discussed in the limitations section above, it is likely that the SGT DSs had less actual "time on the trail" than the SSG DS at the time of their ratings.

Table 10
Overall BARS Ratings (Means) by Rank

DS Rank	N	Mean Rank	Highest Rank	Lowest Rank	Moderate (4-6)	%	High (7-9)	%
SGT	50	7.17	8.82	4.70	19	38	31	62
SSG	28	7.80	9.00	5.59	4	14	24	86

A separate analysis comparing the mean rating of the SGT DS across the three installations found no statistical difference between the sites (Benning, Jackson, and Gordon). See Appendix N for data.

Ratings of Specific BARS items. Table 11 shows the mean supervisor ratings (CDR, 1SG, PSG and/or Senior DS) for each of the BARS items. An independent groups t-test with pooled variance was conducted on each item. The significance level was adjusted using a Bonferroni correction to avoid inflated alpha levels from multiple comparisons. The full data with t-tests results are shown in Appendix N. While the SSG DSs were rated slightly higher on all of the items, only nine of the items were significantly higher. Note also that the mean ratings for nineteen of SGT DSs were in the "High" range. More so, even the lowest rated item, "Displays specific warrior focused knowledge and skills" was rated at the high end of the "Moderate" range.

Table 11
Mean Supervisor Ratings on BARS Items by Rank

How effectively does this Drill Sergeant/how well does this Drill Sergeant ...

BARS Item	SGT n = 50	SSG n = 28
Adhere to policies on fraternization	8.0	8.3
Set good example regarding personal appearance	7.8	8.1
Works well with persons of diverse backgrounds	7.7	8.2
Follow regimens of Buddy system	7.7	8.2
Demonstrate understanding of diverse backgrounds	7.6	8.1
Set good example regarding military bearing	7.6	8.0
Set good example regarding physical fitness	7.6	8.4
Demonstrate behavior consistent with Army values	7.6	8.2
Follow and enforce IET rules	7.5	8.1
Conduct physical readiness training	7.4	7.8
Follow safety guidelines	7.4	8.0
Encourage trainees during training	7.2	7.8*
Demonstrate respect for trainees	7.2	7.6
Effort put forth in performing DS duties	7.1	7.9
Relate to and work with peers	7.1	8.0
Demonstrate respect for IET mission and philosophy	7.0	7.6
Manage stress	7.0	7.6
Handle potentially volatile situations	7.0	7.7
Show initiative in performing DS duties	7.0	7.8
Knowledgeable about M16	6.9	7.8*
Teach, coach, and mentor trainees	6.9	7.5
Motivate trainees	6.9	7.7*
Correct trainee performance	6.8	7.6
React in unexpected, frustrating situations	6.8	7.6*
Adapt to change	6.8	7.6*
Manage difference of opinion	6.8	7.6
Teach drill and ceremony	6.7	7.3
Conduct/assist basic rifle marksmanship training	6.7	7.7*
Provide feedback during weapons training	6.7	7.6*
Seek additional responsibilities	6.6	7.6*
Counsel trainees	6.6	7.4
Display warrior focused knowledge and skills	6.6	7.5*

*p<.05, includes Bonferroni correction for multiple (32) comparisons

Particularly noteworthy are the many items in which the SGT DS were rated both high and not (statistically) different from the SSG DS.

- Adheres to policies on fraternization
- Works well with persons of diverse cultural and social backgrounds
- Follows regimens of Buddy system
- Demonstrates understanding of diverse cultural and social backgrounds
- Demonstrates behavior consistent with Army values
- Follows and enforces IET rules
- Demonstrates respect for trainees
- Manages stress
- Handles potentially volatile situations

These items directly address many of the major concerns about reinstating SGTs as Drill Sergeants, e.g., respect for the trainee, ability to handle stress, and gender integrated training issues. These data suggest that SGTs are fully capable of serving well as Drill Sergeants.

The interim results of this study were provided to TRADOC DCSOPS&T in Nov 2004. Subsequently, the Commander, TRADOC, recommended to the Chief of Staff of the Army that a change be made to Army policy which prohibits Sergeants from serving as Drill Sergeants. In Feb 2005, the CSA directed that Sergeants be reinstated to Drill Sergeant duty. Appendix P shows the Department of Army memoranda requesting the policy change and approval by the CSA.

Conclusions

Based on all the evidence available, and after 18 months of study, there are no systematic data precluding SGTs from returning to Drill Sergeant status. While the SSG DSs were rated slightly higher than the SGT DS, this is to be expected. Overall the ratings of SGT DS were consistently high. Frequent comments from the senior personnel interviewed center around the fact that the SGTs are perceived as energetic and enthusiastic, and eager to learn their job. They pay attention to the rules, and generally cause few problems. Based on the data available,

- SGTs handled stress and managed their anger;
- SGTs were effective DSs;
- The chain of command and senior DSs coached, mentored, and lead SGT DSs;
- The selection criteria were successful in identifying qualified SGTs to be DSs.

Sergeants did well in Drill Sergeant School; they have done well in their IET units. While it was sometimes noted that the SGT DSs lacked experience relative to the SSG DS, in this study the lack of experience did not translate into performance problems, but more a statement of the obvious. SGT DSs were not afraid to ask for help, and the chain of command ensured they got the help they need. Most senior interviewees suggest that it is extremely important to maintain the standards set for selection for the SGTs as well as for all other DS candidates. True leadership time is important, and the complete background check is, by all reports, imperative. All concur that the CDR recommendation is critical, and that the CDR recommending a DS

candidate should actually know the person being recommended. Reception and integration of new personnel is a key part of on the job success; in each of the units studied, all new DSs (regardless of rank) were mentored and coached. As both Fort Benning and Fort Jackson senior personnel stated at the beginning of the study, and again 18 months later, "we set them up for success."

References

Campbell, R. C., Knapp, D. J., & Heffner, T. S. (2002). *Selection for leadership – Transforming NCO promotion* (ARI Special Report 52). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Department of the Army (10 Jun 1987). AR 600-9 *The Army weight control program.* Washington, DC: Author.

Department of the Army (30 Apr 2003). AR 614-200 *Enlisted assignment and utilization management*, Chapter 8, Section 8-13. Washington, DC: Author.

Ford, L. A., Campbell, R. C., Campbell, J. P., Knapp, D. J., & Walker, C. B. (2000). *21st century Soldiers and noncommissioned officers: Critical predictors of performance* (ARI Technical Report 1102). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Headquarters, United States Army Training and Doctrine Command. (2003). TRADOC Pamphlet 525-66 *Military operations. Force operating capabilities.* (Chapter 12, Training and Leadership & Education). Fort Monroe, VA: Author.

Headquarters, United States Army Training and Doctrine Command (15 August 2003). TRADOC Regulation 350-6 *Enlisted initial entry training (IET) policies and administration.* Fort Monroe, Virginia: Author. [Available at http://www-benning.army.mil/DrillSgt/content/course_description.htm]

Headquarters, United States Army Training and Doctrine Command (13 August 2003). Memorandum: Drill Sergeant Study Request. Fort Monroe, VA: Office of Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Training.

Knapp, D. J., Burnfield, J. L., Sager, C. E., Waugh, G. W., Campbell, J. P., Reeve, C L., Campbell, R. C., White, L. A., & Heffner, T. S. (2002). *Development of predictor and criterion measures for the NCO21 research program* (ARI Technical Report 1128). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Knapp, D. J., Heffner, T. S., & Campbell, R. C. (2003). *Recommendations for an Army NCO semi-centralized promotion system for the 21st Century* (ARI Research Report 1807). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Matthews, M. D. & Dyer, J. L. (1999). *A trial program for selection to infantry brigade company command* (ARI Research Report 1746). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Rogers, R. P. (2004a). *Army changes program of instruction at drill sergeant schools.* TRADOC News Service: Author. [Available at http://www.tradoc.army.mil/pao/TNSarchives/April04/045504.htm]

Rogers, R. P. (2004b). *Warrior training incorporated into curriculum at Fort Jackson drill sergeant school.* TRADOC News Service: Author. [Available at http://www.tradoc.army.mil/pao/TNSarchives/October04/102504.htm]

Salter, M., Klein, G., & Graham, S.E. (2004). *Reinstating sergeants as drill sergeants proof-of-principle study: Interim report.* Fort Benning, GA: U.S. Army Research Institute Infantry Forces Research Unit. (unpublished)

U.S. Army Infantry School. *The drill sergeant school, home page*, available at http://www-benning.army.mil/DrillSgt/

Zazanis, M. M. & Lappin, M. S. (1998). *Predicting performance ratings using motivational antecedents* (ARI Technical Report 1077). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

Appendix A

Acronyms

AAC	Army Accessions Command; also USAAC
AAR	After Action Review
AIT	Advanced Individual Training
APFT	Army Physical Fitness Test
AR	Army Regulation
ARI	The U.S. Army Research Institute
BARS	Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales
BCT	Basic Combat Training
BDE	Brigade
BN	Battalion
BNCOC	Basic Noncommissioned Officer Course
Cof C	Chain of Command
CO	Company
CDR	Commander
CSM	Command Sergeant Major
DA	Department of the Army
DCSOPS&T	Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations & Training
DS	Drill Sergeant
DSS	Drill Sergeant School
GED	General Equivalency Diploma
GT	General Technical
HRC	Human Resources Command
IET	Initial Entry Training
MOS	Military Occupational Specialty
NCO	Noncommissioned Officer
OSUT	One Station Unit Training
PLDC	Primary Leadership Development Course
POI	Program of Instruction
PULHES	Physical Profile: Physical capacity/stamina, Upper extremities, Lower extremities, Hearing/ear, Eyes, Psychiatric (military physical profile)
PT	Physical Training
SFC	Sergeant First Class
SGM	Sergeant Major
SGT	Sergeant
SSG	Staff Sergeant
TRADOC	Training and Doctrine Command
UCMJ	Uniform Code of Military Justice
USAAC	U.S. Army Accessions Command
WGI	The Wexford Group International, Inc.

Appendix B

Drill Sergeant Study Background Documents

Office of Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Training, 13 August 2003

Request for ARI
Research-Based Personnel and Training Study or Analysis

1. **Title**: Readmitting Sergeants to Drill Sergeant Duty – Should Sergeants be Drill Sergeants?

2. **Issue**: In Oct 1997, the Army stopped using sergeants as drill sergeants. This was a senior leader decision to increase experience and maturity of drill sergeant cadre. Factors contributing to this decision were the APG incident and subsequent reports as well as training base conditions. The Army places a high confidence level on sergeant capabilities. Sergeants are serving responsibly as combat leaders, recruiters, non-drill sergeant staff sergeant positions, team/squad leaders, and section/crew chiefs. Current senior leaders are considering readmitting sergeants to drill sergeant duty and TRADOC has proposed a one year proof-of-principle pilot. A critical aspect of this one year pilot program is the conduct of data collection/analysis of the impacts and effectiveness of using sergeants as drill sergeants. Our analysis objectives include: 1) How well the sergeants handled stress and managed anger; 2) The degree to which sergeants were effective drill sergeants; 3) How well the chain of command and more senior drill sergeants coached, mentored, and lead the sergeant drill sergeant; 4) How effective the selection process/criteria were in identifying/selecting qualified sergeants to be drill sergeants.

3. **Description**: Based on changes to our training strategy and today's sergeant, TRADOC supports a one year proof of principle, with the approval of the pilot study plan by 1st qtr FY 04 and execution of plan, starting with selection and training of DSs 2nd qtr FY 04. ARI will develop study plan and execute study under the sponsorship of Army Accession Command (AAC). This pilot will occur at three locations utilizing between 60 and 100 sergeants. There will be no more than one sergeant assigned to an IET platoon in both gender integrated and gender pure units. Sergeants will be selected using specified criteria from multiple career fields, leveraging the operational experience of junior NCOS who have served in Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan and Kuwait.

4. **Impact/Benefit**: The results provided by this research effort will provide senior leaders critical insights and information on the effectiveness of sergeants as drill sergeants. Additional potential benefits of this pilot program are:

   a. Army perspective.

(1) Serving as a sergeant drill sergeant will improve the professional development of sergeants and the NCO Corps.
(2) Utilizing sergeants as drill sergeants will leverage the extensive operational experience of junior NCOs.
(3) This pilot will capitalize on the motivation and energy of experienced sergeants.
(4) Since sergeant is the least experienced NCO level, placing too many sergeants in the training base can degrade the depth of experience in the Initial Entry Training Program. We must carefully balance the drill sergeant grade structure.

b. NCO perspective.

(1) High performing sergeants will view drill sergeant duty as a career enhancer.
(2) Serving as a sergeant drill sergeant will improve professional development opportunities and experience.

Drill Sergeant Quota for the SGT Pilot Program

S: 31 October 2003

TAPC-EPK-ID (614-200)

2 October 2003

MEMORANDUM FOR

Chief, Combat Arms Division
Chief, Combat Support Division

Chief, Combat Service Support Career Division

SUBJECT: Drill Sergeant Quota for the **SGT Pilot Program JAN 2004 DSS CLASS (2 JAN 04 – 16 MAR 04)**

1. Enclosed is your Division's Drill Sergeant Quotas IAW EPMD Procedures Manual (reference keyword **"DS"** for procedures).

2. Drill Sergeant Quotas are based on the requirement to provide a limited number of Sergeants at three (3) installations (Ft. Benning, Ft. Jackson, and Ft. Gordon).

3. Nominated NCOs must meet the prerequisites outlined in AR 614-200 as outlined on the Drill Sergeant Nomination Worksheet with the following exceptions.

a. Must be a PLDC graduate not a BNCOC graduate.

b. Must have at least one (1) year time in grade with a minimum of one (1) year leadership time shown on a NCOER.

c. Minimum GT score of 100 cannot be waived.

4. To be counted against this quota mission, NCO's nominated must meet the following requirements:

a. Be assigned to an installation where there is a requirement IAW attached.

b. **CONUS** stationed Soldiers maybe nominated if **DLPCS is 020620** or earlier. Soldiers attending DS School under this quota will attend **TDY and return** and have a **PCS ORDTGC 040620. Requires Division Chief approved TOS waiver (SAM) if Soldier has between 24 – 48 months TOS or Division Chief's signature on the Drill Sergeant Nomination work sheet.**

c. **OCONUS** Soldiers must have an **ORDTGC of 040220** or earlier and on Branch AI to one of the installations where a requirement exists to be eligible for the **MAR 04 Class.**

5. Branches must turn in the following for all Soldiers nominated for DS duty NLT the suspense.

a. CMIF with current EPS1 SSN QUERY from EDAS (PS screen).

b. DRILL SERGEANT APPLICATION / NOMINATION WORKSHEET. The worksheet must be **signed by the Branch Chief or Branch SGM**. This signature indicates a PERMS check was completed on the Soldier and if applicable the Career Branch coordinated with Distribution Division for release of the Soldier from any fenced (see keyword "FENCE) unit.

6. A time on station waiver must be obtained for all Soldiers who have less than 48 months TOS (See keyword "TOS").

7. Refer to keyword "**DS**" in the on-line (LAN) EPMD Procedures Manual for current guidance on the DS nomination process.

8. If applicable, coordinate EFMP and/or Joint Domicile (JD) **before** submission of nomination packet.

9. A background check is conducted on all DS candidates (Volunteer and DA Select); unfavorable information may disqualify NCO from DS duty.

10. The POC at this HQ is MSG Caudill/Mrs. Younger at 5-7868.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

Encl

As

-s-
KENT FRIEDERICH
COL, AD
Chief, Combat Arms Career Division

Appendix C

Description of Overall Plan, Study Timelines and Selected Interview Locations

Four Phased Study Plan

(1) *Front End Analysis – Screening and Selection*

- What are the critical DS screening qualifications/criteria? How do these criteria compare to the standard selection criteria?
- Background interviews conducted with selection board members and personnel who affect the screening process. Examination of DSS selection criteria.

(2) *Front End Analysis – Desired Qualifications*

- What are the additional critical qualifications (attitude, experience, leadership, motivation, and fitness) that a SGT needs to be selected and successful?
- Questionnaires and structured interviews with current and former DSs, with field input from Senior NCOs and CSMs.
- Critical incident approach employed to elicit examples of desirable and undesirable attributes of DSs in order to lay a basis for unit ratings on performance. Develop rating scales. Data include:
  - Rationale for precluding SGTs from the DS program
  - Perceptions of differences in abilities of SGT DSs v SSG or SFCs
  - Assessment of maturity levels required in mixed gender IET
  - Impressions of the optimal time in service/in grade before selection
  - Value of combat /hostile environment experience as requirement
  - Potential for NCO unit turbulence if SGTs are DSs
  - Positive and negative leadership attributes displayed by DSs
  - Impact of unit NCO support channel on screening/selection process

Expected results of the front end-analysis include rationale for selection; capabilities required of a DS; potential additional attributes used to influence selection. Critical incident descriptions as used in behaviorally anchored rating scales provide intangible dimensions or attributes that may affect performance.

(3) *Sergeants at DSS* - Does performance at the School prepare NCOs to assume Drill Sergeant duties? How well do Sergeants fare at DSS? Are there any differences due to SGTs?

- Conduct face-to-face interviews and questionnaires with current DSS Instructors, Students and School personnel.
- Make on site observations of Sergeants in Drill Sergeant School.
- Obtain peer evaluations; graduation statistics; academic averages for all candidates, regardless of rank. Data include:
  - Assessment of adjustment to the School training environment
  - Sergeant DSS success rate compared to SSG and SFC success rate

Reasons for student failure, including reasons, and attrition factors
Preliminary assessment: did DSS prepare for DS duty
Assess stress/anger management evidenced by student behaviors
Ability of SGTs to perform in a gender integrated training environment
Changes to DSS POI needed to accommodate Sergeants
Success of the mentor, coach and lead approach

(4) Analysis of SGTs Serving as DSs - Can SGTs effectively and professionally perform the duties of a DS? How do they compare with the SSGs and SFCs?

- Collect on-site surveys, questionnaires, interviews, and subject matter expert observations of newly graduated SGTs performing DS duties during first few assignments at training units (Fort Jackson - BCT, Fort Gordon - AIT, and Fort Benning - OSUT).
- Employ instruments designed to elicit ratings of new DSs on critical dimensions identified in the critical incident content analyses.
- Survey and interview SGTs, BDE and BN leaders and Training Company CDRs, XOS, 1SGs, SSGs, SFCs, and other unit staff. Interview or survey trainees as appropriate. Data include:
  - Sergeant adjustment to unit training environment.
  - Effectiveness of reception and integration procedures
  - Ability to control behavior to manage emotions and stress
  - Misconduct rates/incidents of DS (by grade and gender)
  - Assessment of ability of SGTs to counsel, mentor and lead Trainees
  - Demonstrated ability to model Army values
  - Assessment of ability to conduct after action reviews
  - Demonstrated field craft skills
  - Ability to perform in a position of authority
  - Determination of ability to train others to standard
  - Assess ability of DS to establish professional relationships with all
  - Confidence of unit leadership in SGT DSs.
  - How well unit senior leaders/DSs coached, mentored and lead SGTs
  - IET Soldier attrition rates and reasons

Study Timelines and Milestones

Oct 03 - Dec. 03

Develop background/demographic questionnaires; interview technique/protocols
Develop/brief test plan to DCSOPS&T and USAAC
Begin collection of critical incidents during interviews
Conduct background interviews/questionnaires with HRC Branch Chiefs, incumbent/former DSs, IET Chains of Command - Forts Benning, Jackson and Gordon; Drill Sergeant Proponency Office Fort Jackson
Refine questionnaires, plan DSS observations
Begin to build critical incident-based performance rating scales (BARS)

Dec 03 - Jan 04

Finalize performance metrics and all student questionnaires. Vet BARS

Jan 04 Administer questionnaires in conjunction with SMA Conference at Fort Bliss.

Finalize BARS.

Jan 04 - Aug 04

Observe SGTs and other candidates during DSS at Forts Benning and Jackson; administer questionnaires; conduct background interviews with DSS instructors. Meet with senior personnel at Forts Benning, Jackson and Gordon to explain study; vet BARS; get field impressions

Apr 04 - Aug 04

Obtain Peer Reviews of DS candidate potential (modified BARS) Forts Benning and Jackson.

Obtain Cadre Reviews of DS candidate potential (modified BARS) Forts Benning and Jackson.

Apr 04 - Mar 05

Interview IET Unit Chain of Command (including BN and BDE CDRs/CSMs) at Forts Benning, Jackson and Gordon.

Apr 04 - Aug 04

Observe SGT DSs during Initial Assignments at Fort Benning. Administer BARS rating instruments as appropriate.

Jul 04 - Nov 04

Observe SGT DSs during Initial Assignments at Fort Gordon, Fort Jackson. Administer BARS rating instruments as appropriate.

Nov 04

Interim Report

Aug 04 – Mar 05

Observe SGT DSs during second/third assignments; observe/interview senior leaders for coaching, mentoring and leading of Drill Sergeants at Forts Benning, Gordon, and Jackson. Administer BARS rating instruments as appropriate.

Jun 05

Document findings for Final Report.

Interviews

Interviews, both formal and informal were conducted with the following personnel over the course of the study. Some personnel were interviewed more than once; others may inadvertently have been omitted from the list. The list does not include any of the

interviewed Sergeant Drill Sergeants or other Drill Sergeant Candidates, nor does it include personnel listed elsewhere. The listing is intended to indicate the depth of the research, and the variety of personnel involved.

HRC
including Chief, Enlisted Distribution and SGMs for Career Management Fields: Aviation/Transportation; Health Services/AG; Engineers; Quartermaster; Armor; Infantry/Drill Sergeant Branch (total 14)

Fort Jackson:
Brigade and Battalion Commanders and Sergeants Major from 1st Combat Training Brigade plus 1/28 Infantry, 2/28 Infantry, 2/13 Infantry, 3/13 Infantry; 4th Training Brigade plus 1/34 Infantry, 2/39 Infantry, 1/61 Infantry, 187th Ordnance; CSM Soldier Support Institute, CSM 369 AG BN Drill Sergeant School, CSM, 1SG, SFC (3), SSG (2), Proponency Office. Also CSMs (2), 1SG, MSG (1), SFC (DS) .(2), SSG (DS), CPT (2).

Fort Benning;
Brigade and Battalion Commanders and Sergeants Major from Basic Combat Training, One Station Unit Training plus 1/19th Infantry, 2/19th Infantry,1/50th Infantry, 2/54th Infantry.

C 1/329th Infantry (Reserve) CDR & 1SG.

Fort Gordon:
Brigade and Battalion Commanders and Sergeants Major from 15th Signal Brigade plus 73d Ordnance Battalion, 369th Signal Battalion, 447th Signal Battalion, 551st Signal Battalion. Also CSM (3), CPTs (3), SFC (DS) (3), 1SG (3)

Appendix D

Nominative Command Sergeants Major Survey

The original survey extended over 7 pages, it has been truncated by line removal, etc.

OVERVIEW: The purpose of this survey is to gather data and information for the U.S. Army Research Institute (ARI) and the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), in the execution of an approved study on the effectiveness of the proof-of-principle pilot program "Utilizing Sergeants As Drill Sergeants".

The study is directed by the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Training, TRADOC, and sponsored by the U S Army Accession Command (USAAC).

SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS: Your participation in completing this survey will enable critical data to be collected, analyzed and recorded. Your input will impact the total study outcome. *Please analyze each standalone statement and circle only one appropriate response per statement. Please use the comment section to provide additional information. Thank you for your cooperation.*

U. S. Army Research Institute Information Privacy Act Statement:

1. Public Law 93-573, called the Privacy Act of 1974, requires that you be informed of the purpose and uses to be made of the information collected in this research. The Department of the Army may collect the information requested on this form under the authority of 10 United States Code 2358.

2. Principal Purpose: **To collect data in conjunction with a Study: Utilizing Sergeants As Drill Sergeants.**

3. Routine Uses: The data collected with this form are to be used for routine research purposes only. They will not become a part of any individual's record and will not be used in whole or in part in making any determination about an individual. The identifiers (name and social security number) are to be used for administrative and statistical control purposes only. Full confidentiality of responses will be maintained in the processing of these data.

4. Mandatory or Voluntary Disclosure and Effect on Individual not Providing Information: Voluntary. Your participation in this research is strictly voluntary. Individuals are encouraged to provide complete and accurate information in the interests of the research, but there will be no effect on individuals not providing all or part of the information.

This notice may be detached from the rest of this form and retained by the individual answering the questionnaire if so desired.

Below are a number of questions about Sergeants as Drill Sergeants and Drill Sergeants in general. Please respond by circling the number that best reflects your answer.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Name:_____Rank: _____

Age: _____Gender: Male Female Time in Military: ____

Military Occupational Specialty (MOS): __Branch: CA CS CSS

Time in MOS: _ Time in Current Unit: _Your Current Unit:___
Type Unit: TO&E TDA Your Current Position: _____

Unit Telephone Number: Commercial _____ DSN_____

E-Mail Address: _____

Please list your special qualifications (i.e. Ranger, Airborne, Special Forces, Recruiter):_____
Combat/Hostile Environment Experience: _____
Drill Sergeant Assignments/Positions:_____

Assignment/ Position	Location Fort/ Post	Rank When You Started	Year Started Assignment	Time (Months) in Assignment/ Position	Females in Unit? (Yes/No)	Sergeants (E5) in DS Positions? (Yes/No)
Drill Sergeant						
IET Unit 1SG						
IET Unit CSM						

General:

Below are a number of questions about "Sergeants as Drill Sergeants" and Drill Sergeants in general. Please answer each question to the best of your ability.

Please respond by circling the number that best reflects your answer.	**0% to 10% (1)**	**20% to 30% (2)**	**40% to 50% (3)**	**60% to 70% (4)**	**80% to 90% (5)**
1. What percent of the ***Sergeants*** you have served with during the past 5 years would you recommend for Drill Sergeant duty?	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
2. What percent of the ***Staff Sergeants*** you have served with during the past 5 years would you recommend for Drill Sergeant duty?	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

3. What percent of the ***Sergeants First Class*** you have served with during the past 5 years would you recommend for Drill Sergeant duty (assuming they met the age and other requirements)?	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

4. Your USAHRC currently sends a certain number of Staff Sergeants and Sergeants First Class to Drill Sergeant School each year.

*If one third to one half of these Soldiers could be **Sergeants**, what kind of impact would that have on:*	**Very Negative Impact (1)**	**Negative Impact (2)**	**No Impact (3)**	**Positive Impact (4)**	**Very Positive Impact (5)**
a. Manning/staffing in the units providing Drill Sergeants	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
b. Quality of training in BCT	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
c. Quality of training in AIT	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
d. Quality of training in OSUT	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
e. Quality of training in gender integrated units	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
f. Professional development of the Sergeants selected for Drill Sergeant duty	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
g. Ability of Sergeants to lead/train/motivate Soldiers when they complete Drill Sergeant duty and are assigned to a TO&E unit	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
h. The Total Army	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Drill Sergeant Selection:

Please respond by circling the number that best reflects your answer.	**Not at all (1)**	**(2)**	Moderate Important **(3)**	**(4)**	**Very Important (5)**
5. How important are each of the following in developing an effective Drill Sergeant?	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
a. Prior combat/hostile environment experience	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
b. Graduate of the PLDC	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
c. Graduate of the BNCOC	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
d. Being closely, effectively mentored and monitored by a Senior Drill Sergeant through the first training cycle	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
e. Prior experience as a crew, team, section or squad leader	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

f. Having a 1SG in the Training Company with prior Drill Sergeant experience	1	2	3	4	5

For a Sergeant to be nominated for Drill Sergeant School in the current pilot program, he/she must meet all of the eligibility criteria for Staff Sergeant and Sergeants First Class, except the requirement to be a BNCOC graduate. PLDC is required instead. In addition, Sergeants must have:

- At least one (1) year time in grade with
- A minimum of one (1) year leadership time shown on a NCOER
- GT score of 100 (cannot be wavered)

6. Would you alter the eligibility criteria for Sergeants in any way? Yes No If yes, what would you change, and why?____

7. What skills, abilities, and personal characteristics would you most want to see in a Soldier before you would recommend him/her for Drill Sergeant duty?

8. Would you look for any different characteristics if you were evaluating a Sergeant instead of a Staff Sergeant for Drill Sergeant duty? Yes ___ No__
If yes, what additional/different characteristics would you look for in a Sergeant?

9. What concerns do you have about Utilizing Sergeants as Drill Sergeants? _____
_____

10. What would you emphasize in the Drill Sergeant School to ensure the success of Sergeants as Drill Sergeants?___

Examples of Good and Poor Drill Sergeant Performance:

Part of this study involves assessing the performance of Drill Sergeants in the field. To execute the field performance phase it is imperative to have specific examples of challenging situations to include both effective and ineffective ways of responding.

Please record any example you recall of an incident where a Drill Sergeant handled a difficult situation well – **for example**, demonstrated especially good judgment in a challenging situation, or initiated an effective disciplinary or training technique?

POSITIVE EXAMPLE

11. Describe the situation: _____
12. What exactly did the Drill Sergeant do or say?_____
13. What do you think made this Drill Sergeant so effective?__

Can you recall an incident where a Drill Sergeant did *not* handle a situation well? Where he or she showed poor judgment, lost control, or used very ineffective disciplinary or training techniques?

NEGATIVE EXAMPLE

14. Describe the situation: _____

15. What exactly did the Drill Sergeant do or say? _____

16. What do you think made this Drill Sergeant *ineffective*?_____

17. What should be done to prevent this kind of situation?_____

Recommended Changes:

18. What would you change or emphasize in the IET environment to ensure the success of Sergeants as Drill Sergeants? _____

19. What would you change or emphasize in the IET environment to ensure that the civilians entering the Army today are adequately prepared for their first duty assignments? _____

20. If you have had experience in IET units both before and after 1997 when Sergeants (E-5) were taken out of the Drill Sergeant Program, what changes have you seen, and how do these changes affect the IET environment and the Drill Sergeant's Duties?_____

Final Comments: Please record any final comments you have about the issues raised in this survey or issues that were not included. **Your comments are very important!**

Results

The 58 men and 3 women from the CSM Conference who filled out the demographic sheet (one did not provide demographics) had served in the following Drill Sergeant Assignments/ Positions:

	Combat Arms	%	Combat Support	%	Combat Service Support	%
Number by MOS	32	52.5	8	13.1	21	34.4
Drill Sergeant	13	40.6	4	50.0	2	9.5
IET Unit 1SG	3	9.4	1	12.5	1	4.8
IET Unit CSM	4	12.5	3	37.5	2	9.5

The responses were as follows:

Please respond by circling the number that best reflects your answer.	**0% to 10% (1)**	**20% to 30% (2)**	**40% to 50% (3)**	**60% to 70% (4)**	**80% to 90% (5)**

1. What percent of the ***Sergeants*** you have served with during the past 5 years would you recommend for Drill Sergeant duty?	1	2	3	4	5

1. What percent of the ***Sergeants*** you have served with during the past 5 years would you recommend for Drill Sergeant duty?

N = 62	Mean = 2.42	St. Deviation = 1.06

2. What percent of the ***Staff Sergeants*** you have served with during the past 5 years would you recommend for Drill Sergeant duty?

N = 62	Mean = 3.16	St. Deviation = 1.09

3. What percent of the ***Sergeants First Class*** you have served with during the past 5 years would you recommend for Drill Sergeant duty (assuming they met the age and other requirements)?

N = 62	Mean = 3.32	St. Deviation = 1.07

4. Your USAHRC currently sends a certain number of Staff Sergeants and Sergeants First Class to Drill Sergeant School each year. *If one third to one half of these Soldiers could be* ***Sergeants****, what kind of impact would that have on:*	**Very Negative Impact** (1)	**Negative Impact** (2)	**No Impact** (3)	**Positive Impact** (4)	**Very Positive Impact** (5)

a. Manning/staffing in the units providing Drill Sergeants

N = 59	Mean = 3.05	St. Deviation = 1.01

b. Quality of training in BCT

N = 59	Mean = 3.37	St. Deviation = .85

c. Quality of training in AIT

N = 59	Mean = 3.20	St. Deviation = .94

d. Quality of training in OSUT

N = 59	Mean = 3.28	St. Deviation = .92

e. Quality of training in gender integrated units

N = 59	Mean = 3.31	St. Deviation = .88

f. Professional development of the Sergeants selected for Drill Sergeant duty

N = 59	Mean = 4.03	St. Deviation = .93

g. Ability of Sergeants to lead/train/motivate Soldiers when they complete Drill Sergeant duty and are assigned to a TO&E unit

N = 60	Mean = 4.17	St. Deviation = .83

h. The Total Army

N = 60	Mean = 4.05	St. Deviation = .79

Drill Sergeant Selection:

Please respond by circling the number that best reflects your answer.	Not at all (1)	(2)	Moderately Important (3)	(4)	Very Important (5)
5. How important are each of the following in developing an effective Drill Sergeant?	1	2	3	4	5

a. Prior combat/hostile environment experience

N = 62	Mean = 2.66	St. Deviation = 1.02

b. Graduate of the PLDC

N = 62	Mean = 4.76	St. Deviation = .56

c. Graduate of the BNCOC

N = 62	Mean = 3.68	St. Deviation = 1.1

d. Being closely, effectively mentored and monitored by a Senior Drill Sergeant through the first training cycle

N = 62	Mean = 4.83	St. Deviation = .45

e. Prior experience as a crew, team, section or squad leader

N = 62	Mean = 4.48	St. Deviation = .74

f. Having a 1SG in the Training Company with prior Drill Sergeant experience

N = 62	Mean = 3.90	St. Deviation = 1.29

The CSMs provided behavioral examples of effective and ineffective performance. The examples they provided are listed; relatively few specific examples of positive and negative DS behavior were provided.

1. Soldier was wearing what appeared to be an unauthorized coat with BDU uniform while in the check-out line at the PX. The Drill Sergeant approached and said, "Excuse me, but I notice you are wearing what appears to be an unauthorized black field jacket." The Soldier informed the DS that the coat was the authorized Navy field jacket and the "Soldier" was in the Navy. The DS thanked the Soldier and apologized. By asking for an explanation instead of jumping on the Navy Petty Officer this DS avoided an embarrassing situation.

2. During Exodus 2003, a DS at the airport observed a Soldier wearing baggy pants, and large printed shirt, and fancy tennis shoes. The DS himself was not was well dressed or neat and professional looking. The DS called the Soldier out of formation and said, "Soldier, your clothes are not in keeping with what a Soldier should look like in civilian travel status." The DS created a negative impression himself by criticizing a subordinate when he himself was not above reproach. It looked like a case of "do as I say, not as I do."

3. There appeared to be some racial tension between a white and a black trainee – they did not get along. The DS made the two trainees battle buddies and said that if he addressed one, the other had to speak for him. The two trainees got to know each other and learned to get along.

4. Trainees were in formation and not at parade rest as ordered. DS told Soldiers to quit talking and remain at parade rest. One continued talking and made smart remarks to DS. The DS lost control and hit the Soldier.

5. On the qualification range a trainee failed to follow instructions prior to going up to the firing line. The DS got into the Soldier's face and started screaming at him nose to nose. DS had a chew of tobacco in his mouth and spit tobacco all over the Soldier's face. Tobacco got in the Soldier's eye and he started screaming and fell to the ground. There was a no tobacco policy and the DS was caught sneaking a chew. DS looked bad as a result.

6. A Soldier in the unit refused to train and wanted out of the Army. Several attempts were made to talk to him but he was on the verge of getting chaptered out. A DS (with 16+ years in the Army) sat down with the Soldier and listened to what the Soldier had to say. Then he offered some alternative suggestions. He created choices for the Soldier, yet allowed the Soldier to make the final decision about his course of action. The Soldier, not the DS, decided on a course of action. The Soldier chose to complete basic training and now serves in the Army.

7. A Soldier was issued a weapon for the first time. The Soldier was extremely nervous and did not hold the weapon correctly. The DS physically pushed the Soldier's weapon, knocking it out of the Soldier's grasp. The DS then slammed his fist into his other hand and said, "If I see you do that again you will go down!" DS never instructed Soldier, just walked away. The Soldier picked up her weapon and was left to do the best she could.

8. A trainee refused to do push-ups during PT session. DS removed the trainee from the PT area and explained to the trainee the importance of complying with Army guidance and the benefits and consequences if the trainee fails to adhere to the stated standards. DS demonstrated knowledge of the requirements of basic/AIT training and used effective communication to motivate Soldier to adhere to Army requirements.

9. Trainee attempted to turn in his weapon after training on the range and didn't sound off with weapon. DS snatched the weapon from the Soldier and told the Soldier he was a "dirt bag" then shoved the weapon back to the trainee. The trainee was demoralized and humiliated in front of other trainees, and DS demonstrated his inability to provide constructive on-the-spot training.

10. Several Soldiers could not qualify with their weapons. DS used several Soldiers who were expert with their weapons to coach those who could not pass – under his supervision. DS understood the importance of teamwork.

11. One Soldier was late for a formation. The DS used mass punishment. He had the entire platoon perform push-ups.

12. Trainee was challenging the DS authority by lying on the ground and refusing to move. He said he wanted a discharge and would not move until he got it. The DS talked to the Soldier and explained that he had made a commitment. The DS told the Soldier that he would him help meet that commitment. The Soldier graduated and served successfully in the Army.

13. DS caught a trainee using smokeless tobacco, which is unauthorized. The DS made the trainee put the tobacco in his mouth and then proceeded to CAPE (corrective action through physical exercise) for nearly 20 minutes.

14. DS showing a caring attitude toward trainees by requesting permission from chain of command for trainee to call home.

Appendix E

Survey: Former and Incumbent Drill Sergeants

Utilizing Sergeants as Drill Sergeants

OVERVIEW: The purpose of this interview is to gather data and information for the U.S. Army Research Institute (ARI) and the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), in the execution of an approved study on the effectiveness of the proof-of-principle pilot program "Utilizing Sergeants As Drill Sergeants".

The study is directed by the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Training, TRADOC, and sponsored by the U S Army Accession Command (USAAC).

U. S. Army Research Institute Information Privacy Act Statement:

1. Public Law 93-573, called the Privacy Act of 1974, requires that you be informed of the purpose and uses to be made of the information collected in this research. The Department of the Army may collect the information requested on this form under the authority of 10 United States Code 2358.

2. Principal Purpose: **To collect data in conjunction with a Study: Utilizing Sergeants As Drill Sergeants.**

3. Routine Uses: The data collected with this form are to be used for routine research purposes only. They will not become a part of any individual's record and will not be used in whole or in part in making any determination about an individual. The identifiers (name and social security number) are to be used for administrative and statistical control purposes only. Full confidentiality of responses will be maintained in the processing of these data.

4. Mandatory or Voluntary Disclosure and Effect on Individual not Providing Information: Voluntary. Your participation in this research is strictly voluntary. Individuals are encouraged to provide complete and accurate information in the interests of the research, but there will be no effect on individuals not providing all or part of the information.

This notice may be detached from the rest of this form and retained by the individual answering the questionnaire if so desired.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Name:_____Rank: _____

Age: _____Gender: Male Female Time in Military: ____

Military Occupational Specialty (MOS): __Branch: CA CS CSS

Time in MOS: _ Time in Current Unit: _Your Current Unit:___
Type Unit: TO&E TDA Your Current Position: _____

Unit Telephone Number: Commercial _____ DSN_____

E-Mail Address: _____

Please list your special qualifications (i.e. Ranger, Airborne, Special Forces, Recruiter):_____
Combat/Hostile Environment Experience: _____
Drill Sergeant Assignments/Positions:_____

Drill Sergeant Experience:

Assignment/Position	Fort/ Post	Rank When You Started	Year Started Assignment	Time (Months) in Assignment/ Position	Females in Unit? (Yes/No)	Sergeants (E5) in DS Positions? (Yes/No)
Drill Sergeant						
IET Unit 1SG						
IET Unit CSM						

Challenges of the Drill Sergeant Job

Thinking back to your own experience as a drill sergeant, what are some of the things that make a drill sergeant's job challenging or difficult? (*Trainee attitudes? Gender issues? Schedule? Chain of command? Post support?)*

What are some of the things that helped you deal with the challenges of the job? (*Fellow DS? Things you learned in DS School? Chain of Command?)*

Drill Sergeant Selection

Is there anything you would change about the current system of nominating and selecting drill sergeants in order to ensure you get the best candidates? (*Is volunteering important? Criteria Army should add/drop? Changes to the Bn Cdr evaluation, psych evaluation?)*

Is there a type of person who definitely should not be a drill sergeant? Yes No
If yes, how would you identify this kind of person or ensure they're not selected for DS duty?

Drill Sergeant School

What DS School did you attend?

What were the most challenging parts of DS school?

What were the most important or valuable parts of DS School?

Once you were on the job, were there areas where you felt your preparation was a little weak? Things you weren't sure you were prepared for?

If they start using Sergeants as Drill Sergeants again, is there anything you would change about the way drill sergeants are trained? For example, are there topics or techniques you might add or place more emphasis on to help DS candidates with relatively little leadership experience? (*Basic skills? disciplinary strategies? counseling trainees? Stress/anger management?*)

Drill Sergeants On-the-Job

During your first six months or so on the job, what kind of training or mentoring did you receive? *(Did you shadow anyone your first cycle? Have a mentor or buddy? Get constructive feedback/counseling? Have good role models?)*

What are the most important things the IET chain of command can do to support drill sergeants?

What can the chain of command do to help prevent negative incidents in the IET environment?

What aspect of the Drill Sergeant experience was most valuable to you - personally and professionally?

Examples of Good and Poor Drill Sergeant Performance

Part of this project involves assessing the performance of Drill Sergeants in the field.

To do this it helps to have specific examples of challenging situations and both effective and ineffective ways of responding.

Thinking back to your own experiences as a drill sergeant, even when you were a trainee yourself, can you recall any incidents where a drill sergeant really handled a situation well, or showed especially good judgment or came up with a really effective disciplinary or training technique?

POSITIVE EXAMPLE
Describe the situation:

What exactly did the DS do or say?

What do you think made this drill sergeant so effective? *(Prior experience? Good training? Good role models?* Supportive *unit climate? Personality?)*

Now can you recall any incidents where a drill sergeant really did *not* handle a situation well?

Where he or she showed poor judgment, lost control, or used ineffective disciplinary or training techniques?

NEGATIVE EXAMPLE
Describe the situation:

What exactly did the DS do or say?

What do you think contributed to this problem/poor judgment/ineffective behavior? (*Lack of experience? Not covered in DS school? Lack of good role models? Poor oversight in unit? Personality not suited to job?)*

What might be done to prevent this kind of situation? (*Better DS screening? Better mentoring? More chain of command oversight?)*

Think about the most ***impressive*** drill sergeant you've ever known. What was it about him/her that impressed you?

Think about the ***worst*** drill sergeant you've ever seen. What was it about the person that made him/her so bad as a drill sergeant?

Is there anything you would you like to add? Any other thoughts about the Drill Sergeant experience or things the Army can do to better select, train, or support drill sergeants?

Results

As part of the front end analysis, an open ended response survey was given to 95 former and incumbent DSs. Average time in service was 14 years, average age 33 years. There were 80 Combat Arms, 11 Combat Service Support, and four Combat Support Soldiers, four First Sergeants, 50 SFCs, 40 SSGs and one CSM. Some Soldiers did not answer all questions; some wrote multiple answers. The most frequent responses are summarized, in order of frequency.

Primary challenges of DS duty. 1. Time/time management; long hours/days, little free time for family or personal business. 2. The chain of command; interference with DS performance; lack of trust of DSs to do jobs. 3. Trainee attitude and willingness to learn, failure to have realistic expectations about Army, overall immaturity, varying backgrounds.

How DSs deal with the challenges. 1. Overwhelmingly: share, vent or receive support from other DSs or DS mentors or battle buddy partner. 2. Support from chain of command, CSM and 1SG, and overall command climate. 3. Self-reliance, spiritualism, family support at home, to include the dog.

DS selection and satisfaction with current policy. 1. DSs should be volunteers who want to be there. Psychological evaluation is useless or a "joke." Commander/senior NCO evaluations should be by someone who actually knows the candidate, to provide better prescreening of candidates. 2. Maturity, experience, time in service/grade, squad leader time and overall knowledge.

Greatest challenges within DSS. 1. Difficulty learning Drill and Ceremony modules, much information in short time, attention to detail, develop study habits. 2. Working with peers and instructors of varying competence and motivation.

Most valuable aspect of DSS. 1. Attention to detail (modules, inspections). 2. Learning AR 350-6 and IET policy. 3. Time down range watching DSs/trainees. 4. DS leaders/mentors and classroom discussions.

Where candidates felt insufficiently prepared. More time on modules, attention to detail, IET policy and regs. More days down range, train the trainer, leader/mentor discussions, overall refreshers on basic skills and Army Values. Professional development - self-discipline and PT.

Changes to DSS if SGTs were included. 1. Greater focus on basic Soldier skills. 2. Better disciplinary strategies. 3. Leader time, time in service/grade requirements. 4.

Experience as "turtle" or full cycle shadow in IET unit, *prior to DSS*. 5. Ensure SGT mature enough for interpersonal relationships with trainees/parents, can cope with stress and manage anger.

Most important to success on the job. 1. Overwhelmingly: rely on battle buddy, peer, senior mentors. 2. Shadow-turtle time in IET company. 3. Check-rides, constructive feedback, counseling, AARs. 4. Resource support (computers, supplies, etc.). 5. Chain of command understand/trust what DSs do, listen to recommendations, enforce regulations and standards.

Preventing negative incidents. 1. Commanders monitor, check and inspect, not micromanage, allow DSs to do jobs using in place systems. 2. Ensure DSs have enough family time, cycle breaks, and time off to prevent burnout.

The most valuable or rewarding aspect of the job. 1. "Graduation faces," pride in training new Soldiers, transitioning civilians to Soldiers, thanks from families. 2. Interacting with, training, helping all kinds of people. 3. Personal growth/self-improvement, chance to give back to the Army.

Overall qualities of a DS. Most impressive: right appearance/demeanor, standards-based leadership, desire to train Soldiers. 1. Attitude, confidence, professionalism, energy, hard work. 2. Appearance, physically fit, positive image. A DS that was "clean cut, pressed and spit shined." 3. Adherence to standards, ability to do the right thing, lead from the front, consistent, fair, high expectations.4. Positive, charismatic motivational leadership style inspiring respect not fear, calm, patient demeanor. 5. Desire to train, tactical competence, relating well to others, committed to the job.

Worst DSs: poor attitudes, negativity and immaturity, apparent dislike of people. 1. Poor work ethic, lack of knowledge/experience, little squad leader time. 2. Bad judgment, training shortcuts, poor decision-making/organizational skills. 3. Appearance, including uniform, overweight, impression of lack of confidence. 4. Inappropriate behavior, loss of control, poor leadership traits, fraternization and self-centered instead of Soldier-centered.

Appendix F

HRC Interview Guide

Interviewer: _____ Date: _____

Drill Sergeant Research Project:

Purpose. *The purpose of this interview is to learn more about the drill sergeant nomination, evaluation, and selection process.*

Background. The interviews and data collected at the Human Resources Command are important components of a study directed by the TRADOC DCSOPS&T, sponsored by the US Army Accession Command (USAAC), and conducted by the US Army Research Institute (ARI) with the assistance of the Wexford Group. The goal of the study is to provide Army leaders with information on factors relevant to the performance of sergeants assigned to drill sergeant duty in the "proof of principle" test authorized by the Chief of Staff of the Army.

Name: _____ Age: _____ Male Female

Rank: _____ Time in Grade: _____ Years in the Army: _____

CMF/MOS: _____ Branch Type: CA CS CSS

Specialty training or special qualifications: _____
Current Position: _____

Primary Responsibilities: _____

Drill Sergeant Selection Process

1. How many Soldiers in this branch are currently serving as drill sergeants?

2. Where do most drill sergeants from this branch go for their drill sergeant tour of duty?

3. About how many Soldiers in this branch start DS school each year?

4. About how many DS packets do you require from the field to get the number of Soldiers you need to send to DS School each year?

5. What is the typical nomination process for DS in this branch? (e.g., Do you review files and identify possible candidates, or is this left entirely up to the units? How do you decide which units the DS should come from? How do you handle Soldier initiated requests?)

6. Does this branch impose any additional selection criteria beyond those in AR614-200, or have you had to waive certain requirements to get the number of DS required? (e.g., time in grade requirements)

7. What does the typical psychological evaluation consist of?

8. What does the standard background check consist of?

9. What are the most common reasons Soldiers are found ineligible or are not approved for DS School?

10. How do things like deployments, time in grade or time in station restrictions affect the branch's ability to meet its DS quota?

Sergeants as Drill Sergeants

11. How many sergeants from this branch are in the E5 pilot program?

12. How were these Soldiers selected? Were you looking for anything special?

13. If the decision is made to continue to allow sergeants to serve as DS...

a) could you continue to select candidates this way?
b) what would you add to the current requirements for sergeants?
c) what would you drop from the current requirements?

14. In your opinion, what is the best way to assess whether or not a Soldier has the maturity, integrity and character required of a Drill Sergeant?

15. How might the DS selection process in general be improved?

a) any specific changes to current selection criteria for SGTs or SSG/SFC?
b) what would you like to see 1st SGTs or unit commanders pay more attention to when they are nominating or evaluating DS candidates?

16. What do you see as the pros and cons of using SGTs as Drill Sergeants? Do you foresee any positive or negative *long-term* effects on operational units or individual Soldier's careers?

Drill Sergeant School

17. What is the average DS School graduation rate for Soldiers from this branch?

18. What are the primary reasons Soldiers from this branch fail to graduate, or don't make it to their DS duty assignment?

19. Do Soldiers in this branch have any special advantages or disadvantages in DS School? (e.g., fewer leadership opportunities, more volunteers, experience in gender integrated units?)

20. What do most Soldiers in this branch think about DS School/ DS duty?

21. How many true volunteers, or Soldier initiated requests do you get for DS School? How many try to avoid it or ask *not* to be considered?

22. What could the Army or the Branch do to encourage more high quality NCOs to volunteer for DS duty?

Is there anything you would you like to add to what we've covered here? Any other thoughts about the DS experience or things the Army can do to better select, train, or support Drill Sergeants?

Appendix G

Summary of In-Depth Individual Interviews with Seven Former Drill Sergeants

Five men and two women: SGM, 1SG, SFCs (4), SSG.
AR (2), one IN, EN, MI, AG, HR
Located at Forts Knox (2), Eustis, Polk, Huachuca, Benning, and HRC -Alexandria, VA.
DS experience 1988 – 2004, averaged 2.7 yrs DS time, range 1.5 - 4 yrs.
Gender Integrated Training (4), Senior DS (3), 1SG (2) PSG (2)
Experience: OSUT/ Benning, Leonard Wood, Knox; BCT/Knox (2), Leonard Wood, Jackson; AIT/ Leonard Wood, ROTC Basic Camp/Knox.

What makes the DS job difficult?
1. Long hours leading to stress, lack of sleep, family problems; juniors lack experience dealing with stress; no break between cycles; only Christmas holiday.
2. DS shortages – some may have to work day and night.
3. Trainee attitudes: don't want to take orders; cocky – present selves same way as on streets; unable to follow instructions; don't want to give up old lifestyle for Army ways
4. Trainees with injuries/medical problems should have been screened out; DS not trained to identify physical problems, or when to refer to doctor.
5. No experience with females; fear say wrong thing; brings officer micromanagement.
6. Lack of trust by chain of command (CoC).
7. Trainees know rules; complain if raise voice; say "you can't do that to me."
8. People from diverse backgrounds (e.g., inner city kid never take orders from someone of another race; some who have always had everything done for them).
9. Maturity/confidence to talk w/o fear of embarrassment in front of Trainees or other DS.
10. Female DS - people who don't think she can do it – judged too soft or hard (bitchy).
11. 11B not used to working with women. Different lifestyles and communication style.
12. 11B vs other MOSs; using experience not necessarily the TSP.
13. Regs on treatment of trainees/trainee abuse (350-6 and 350-12) tell what you cannot do; have to learn what you CAN do on your own, from experience.

What helps DS on the job?
1. Professionalism of other DS
2. Sharing problem cases with other DS
3. Good training schedule- "it works if you follow it"
4. Good mentors; strong tradition of experienced mentoring new
5. Never being left alone with trainees during first cycle
6. Always have 2 female DS in GI unit; they see things a male DS can't.
7. How to release Soldiers; do complex paperwork; CoC support recommendations; no "Congressionals."
8. Need CoC who use UCMJ to support DS; help DS establish authority with trainees.
9. Ask questions about differences between DSS way and the on-the-ground way

What do GOOD Drill Sergeants do?
1. Follow through; show consistency.
2. Show trainees you care about them
3. Counsel trainees as outlined in manual, adapt based on your own experience
4. Identify injuries; Soldiers who should have been screened out for physical problems
5. "If you don't believe in what you're doing you don't belong here."

6. Ask help in tough situations; take advice when given; work together as a team.
7. Interact professionally, especially in front of trainees; never embarrass another DS.
8. Mentor new DS
9. During first few days keep trainees scared – establish discipline, don't allow clowning.
10. NEVER be with trainee alone; insist on battle buddy or other DS.
11. Take care of each other – watch for signs of stress, DS too tired to function; ensure all get sleep.
12. Golden rules: don't fight privates, don't have sex with them, don't take their money.
13. Make your expectations clear – communicate the standards.
14. Make sure punishments not interfere with chow (3), church, or sleep (7 hours).
15. Look for Soldiers having trouble; pull them aside for personal instruction.
16. If an individual infraction, punish the Soldier who committed it, not the entire group.
17. Show self-restraint; never let a private get under your skin.
18. Get through to trainees with different backgrounds/life experiences.
19. Talk to trainees, ask questions, don't jump to conclusions about people/actions.
20. Respond to deficiencies with other than push-ups. Creative corrective action.
21. Be inventive conducting training; capture trainees' attention and keep it interesting.
22. Talk to battle buddies; make sure DSs don't contradict each other.
23. Know the standard/live the standard *all the time*; not because they're DS, but because good NCOs.
24. Understand that being a DS is not about "smokin" people.
25. Change leadership style as trainees progress from Red to White to Blue phase

What will a good CoC do?

1. Help DS deal with stress, encourage DS to help each other
2. Make sure new DS have good mentors
3. Never leave new guy alone; tradition of experienced guys taking care of new guys.
4. Co Cdr backs DS up in front of trainees.
5. Emphasize values – what's right and what's wrong
6. CSM/1SG care about DS; send home to family when can, ensure enough sleep.
8. 1SG out with DSs, noticing things DS might let go
9. 1SG's list of things to improve next cycle; keep DS motivated and learning.
10. Recognize DS still learning first 6 months on trail; give chance to observe/learn.
11. Allow DS to manage their own; decide not need all, DS spend time with families.
12. Support DS in UCMJ lest DS lose face with trainees and inappropriate discipline.
13. Ensure new DS paired with someone who knows the rules and sticks to the rules.
14. Bn Cdr talk to DS every day, point out positive, say thank-you; not just negative.
15. At the end of each phase, make sure DS have chance to talk to chain of command.

What about DS selection?

1. Volunteers better, less likely to quit or fail; non-volunteers can be good. DA ensure volunteers not just to get promoted
2. Some MOS just not cut out for BCT – can't teach basic combat skills.
3. SGTs should be promotable.
4. Make sure Soldiers know/live by Army values inside and out; confident, care about product.
5. Review previous counseling statements to look for indicators of temper issues.
6. Check reading comprehension for modules, passing tests; some college helpful.
7. Make sure DS have real leadership time – without leadership time make mistakes.

What about DS training?

1. Training is good; physically and mentally demanding.
2. Not trained to identify physical problems; need to know when to refer to MD
3. Hard to memorize, especially Drill/Ceremonies; how to instruct in marksmanship
4. Emphasize leadership role of DS; some trainees disciplined, some not.
5. Need different scenarios (refuses to train, violent, refuses battle buddy, gay, false accusations)
6. More training in completing counseling forms, recommendations DS can make; paperwork to get Soldier released/chaptered out.
7. Train DS how to train, be better instructors; relevant to AIT.
8. Ways to shape/mold trainees positively; build up trainee without losing discipline.

How to make the SGT as DS program work?

1. Pay attention to number and kind of DS; kind of unit for young less experienced.
2. Make time in grade requirement since some promoted to SGT quite young.
3. Teach young DS to treat others as they would wish to be treated.
4. Provide modules prior to school so they can start memorizing.
5. Give SGTs opportunity to "turtle" –follow experienced DS around.
6. Give DS more authority/power to discipline trainees.
7. Allow DS to stress on trainees to train for modern battlefield 4 hrs sleep/night.

Appendix H

Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales (Full Survey)

Instructions: Please evaluate each Drill Sergeant ... on the following dimensions. Read through the descriptions of Drill Sergeant behaviors and then select (circle) the number from one through nine that most closely resembles the behavior you typically see from this Drill Sergeant. The number one is always the lowest, describing the least desirable behavior; the number nine is always the best. Most people will fall somewhere in between on most scales. That is why the words are included to give you an idea of the typical behaviors associated with low, moderate and high performance, and why you can choose any number from one to nine.

Knowledge of Program of Instruction and Initial Entry Training Philosophy

Drill and Ceremonies		
How effectively does this Drill Sergeant teach Drill and Ceremonies?		
Issues commands incorrectly or hesitantly. Instructions are not clear or consistent and demonstrations may include mistakes.	Delivers commands correctly; most instructions are clear and mistakes are minor and infrequent.	Delivers commands correctly and confidently; uses appropriate talk-through, and step-by-step methods of instructions for each module.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
How effectively does this Drill Sergeant correct Trainee performance?		
Resorts to yelling and berating Trainees when their attention wanders or they fail to perform correctly.	Seldom resorts to berating Trainees, but does not always adjust voice for maximum effect.	Corrections are clear and authoritative. Modulates voice for maximum effect.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
Physical Training		
How effectively does this Drill Sergeant conduct physical readiness training?		
Fails to demonstrate proper and effective techniques; developmental PT is assigned without regard to Trainee's level of fitness.	Demonstrates proper techniques; developmental PT is usually appropriate but may not always reflect individual differences in fitness.	Demonstrates exceptional fitness as well as proper techniques; developmental PT takes individual differences in fitness levels into account.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
POI Content		
How effectively does this Drill Sergeant display specific warrior focused knowledge and skills?		
Does not display knowledge or skill required to perform many of the tasks he/she is required to teach Trainees.	Displays adequate knowledge of training tasks; has sufficient skill to demonstrate proper techniques.	Highly competent in all aspects of training; able to explain why certain techniques are better than others and to provide extra information.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9

Weapons Training		
How knowledgeable is this Drill Sergeant about the M16 series rifle?		
Does not display knowledge or skill required to perform many of the weapons related tasks he/she is supposed to be teaching Trainees.	Displays adequate knowledge of weapons training tasks; has sufficient skill to demonstrate proper techniques.	Highly competent in all aspects of weapons training; able to explain and demonstrate why certain techniques are better than others.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
How effectively does this Drill Sergeant conduct/assist with Basic Rifle Marksmanship training?		
Does not display knowledge or skill required to train BRM; instruction and supervision is poorly organized and TSP/SOP is not followed; Trainee deficiencies are not corrected properly or effectively.	Displays adequate BRM skills; follows TSP/SOP and safety guidelines during exercises; identifies and corrects the most common Trainee mistakes and deficiencies.	Displays exceptional BRM skills; consistently monitors Trainee performance, corrects mistakes and offers performance enhancing tips and techniques.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
How well does this Drill Sergeant provide feedback during weapons training?		
Unable to provide clear, accurate instructions to Trainees or answer many questions.	Able to identify and correct the most common mistakes, but not likely to answer difficult questions.	Immediately notices and corrects even slight performance deficiencies in Trainees.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
How effectively does this Drill Sergeant follow safety guidelines?		
Often fails to follow safety guidelines; sometimes permits unsafe conditions during training; does not monitor Trainees carefully.	Generally follows safety guidelines and instructions. Enforces SOPs when using weapons or other equipment; frequently checks Trainee behavior.	Alert to safety at all times, manages risk and monitors Trainee behavior to ensure compliance, taking into consideration Trainee fatigue, stress, and overall inexperience, especially when using dangerous equipment.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9

Instructional Techniques		
To what extent does this Drill Sergeant encourage Trainees during training?		
Belittles Trainees having difficulty executing training tasks; fails to provide constructive feedback or hands-on corrections.	Repeats instructions and demonstrations as required. Does not belittle Trainees having difficulty with a task.	Uses hands-on demonstrations and tries different methods of explaining tasks when Trainees are having trouble.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9

To what extent does this Drill Sergeant teach, coach and mentor Trainees?		
Fails to coach or mentor Trainees who are having problems; does not provide useful feedback to improve performance.	Generally tries to coach or mentor Trainees who are having problems; provides feedback to improve performance but it is not always helpful.	Always takes a coaching or mentoring approach with Trainees who are having problems; provides helpful, specific performance feedback.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
To what extent does this Drill Sergeant motivate Trainees?		
Relies on punishment or threats to influence Trainee behavior; yells/curses at Trainees when they fail to meet standards; uses mass punishment for individual infractions.	Occasionally resorts to yelling at Trainees; has a repertoire of several kinds of disciplinary actions in addition to simply dropping Trainees for push-ups.	Recognizes effort as well as accomplishments; creative in designing corrective actions that are relevant to the infraction and creates true learning opportunities.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
Respect for Trainees and the IET mission		
To what extent does this Drill Sergeant demonstrate respect for the philosophy and mission of Initial Entry Training?		
Fails to provide constructive feedback to Trainees having performance problems; encourages discouraged Trainees to quit.	Listens to Trainees who want to talk about personal problems; attempts to help them overcome or resolve them; lets Trainees know that DS care about their welfare and development.	Schedules counseling for Trainees who appear troubled; extends self to help Trainees resolve personal problems; lets Trainees know that DS are committed to their welfare and development.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
To what extent does this Drill Sergeant demonstrate respect for Trainees?		
Repeatedly shows disrespect for Trainees through name-calling, threatening, humiliating or physically abusive treatment.	Seldom if ever resorts to berating Trainees; generally uses positive motivational techniques.	Never resorts to threats or humiliation; creative use of a variety of positive motivational techniques.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9

How effectively does this Drill Sergeant counsel Trainees?		
Display minimum skills and little interest in counseling Trainees; spends little time in preparation for or conducting feedback.	Displays adequate knowledge of counseling; prepares for sessions and treats Trainees with respect; feedback is appropriate.	Highly competent in all aspects of counseling, giving individual attention to the needs and performance of each Trainee; provides helpful constructive feedback.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
To what extent does this Drill Sergeant follow regulations about the Buddy System?		
Often fails to follow Regulations on buddy system; does not always ensure mixed gender rules are followed.	Generally ensures buddy system is followed, but occasionally counsels individuals without another Trainee present.	Ensures Trainees are accompanied by a buddy during counseling; is especially sensitive to and follows procedures required in counseling Trainees of a different gender.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9

The Drill Sergeant as a Role Model

Integrity, Discipline, and Adherence to Army Values		
To what extent does this Drill Sergeant demonstrate behavior consistent with Army values?		
Has difficulty accepting and following superiors' orders; fails to take responsibility for his/her job-related errors.	Obeys direct orders; generally takes responsibility for job-related mistakes or poor decisions.	Obeys orders; ensures others are not blamed for his/her mistakes; honest even if it goes against own interests.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
To what extent does this Drill Sergeant follow IET rules and regulations?		
Often fails to follow rules and regulations. Encourages peers to do things his/her way instead of going by the book.	Makes an effort to learn and follow applicable rules, policies and regulations in IET.	Knows/follows rules, policies and regulations; uses them to guide all behavior; encourages peers to follow rules.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9

Military Bearing and Appearance		
To what extent does this Drill Sergeant set a good example for Trainees with respect to physical fitness?		
Is overweight or in poor physical condition; avoids exercise.	Meets basic standards for physical fitness.	Exercises consistently to maintain excellent physical fitness.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9

To what extent does this Drill Sergeant set a good example for Trainees with respect to personal appearance?		
Has appeared before Trainees in wrong, improper or poorly maintained uniform.	Dresses properly and in accord with Army standards.	Always dresses sharply in correct and meticulously maintained uniform.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9

To what extent does this Drill Sergeant set a good example for Trainees with respect to military bearing?		
Often fails to display proper military bearing; fails to display proper military customs and courtesies.	Usually displays good military bearing; generally a good role model for how a Soldier should act and conduct him/herself.	Consistently maintains excellent military bearing; sets outstanding example by maintaining standards regardless of the situation.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
How well does this Drill Sergeant adhere to the Army's policies on fraternization?		
Sometimes behaves in a manner that could be construed as not in keeping with policy; does not always show good judgment.	Maintains ethical standards. Exhibits correct, moral behavior. Exercises self-control.	Demonstrates the highest ethical standards, and requires them of others. Behaves in a manner beyond reproach. Shows good judgment.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
Ability to Manage Stress and Anger		
How effectively does this Drill Sergeant manage stress?		
Displays frequent flashes of temper and anger; responds to Trainees with shouts; easily provoked by Trainees.	Generally maintains control in stressful situations; seldom provoked to anger by Trainees.	Maintains control in all situations; responds calmly/ authoritatively to deliberate provocation by Trainees.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**

How effectively does this Drill Sergeant react in unexpected, frustrating situations?		
Easily frustrated in situations that do not go as planned.	Usually controls frustration when things do not go as planned.	Takes it in stride; adapts plan easily and readily when things do not go as planned.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9

1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
How effectively does this Drill Sergeant handle potentially volatile situations?		
When confronted with potentially volatile situations, tends to escalate tension.	Usually asks for help or back-up from others if appropriate. Sometimes escalates volatile situation.	Skilled at defusing volatile situations; knows when to ask for help or back-up from fellow DS or chain of command.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9

Adaptability		
How effectively does this Drill Sergeant adapt to change?		
Has difficulty functioning effectively in new situations; does not adapt quickly to changes in schedules, policies, responsibilities, or personnel.	Able to modify behavior or plans to respond adequately to unexpected events or conditions; adapts fairly quickly to changes in schedules, policies; responsibilities, or personnel	Acts quickly to accommodate unexpected events or conditions; develops innovative and imaginative approaches to dealing with unexpected events; adapts smoothly to changes.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9

Attitude toward Drill Sergeant Duty and Peers

Level of Effort and Initiative		
How much effort does this Drill Sergeant put forth performing Drill Sergeant duties?		
Puts minimal effort into learning how to train most effectively.	Puts sufficient effort into a task to get it accomplished; puts forth extra effort if necessary.	Puts forth extra effort to ensure that training is well organized and effective.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
To what extent does this Drill Sergeant show initiative performing Drill Sergeant duties?		
Seldom takes the initiative to address small problems before they become big ones.	Often takes the initiative to address problems or learn better ways of doing tasks	Demonstrates a great deal of initiative addressing problems to learn better ways of doing tasks
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
To what extent does this Drill Sergeant seek additional responsibilities?		
Avoids additional responsibilities where possible.	Willing to accept share of additional responsibilities.	Enthusiastically takes on new challenges and additional responsibilities.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
Relating to and Supporting Peers		
How effectively does this Drill Sergeant relate to and work with peers?		
Tends to be rude, selfish, and disrespectful to peers; generally fails to provide assistance to others; seldom accepts guidance or advice from others.	Usually tactful and respectful when dealing with peers; provides assistance to other DS, especially when there is a clear need to do so.	Always treats peers in a tactful and respectful manner; offers needed assistance without waiting to be asked; asks other DS for guidance and advice in difficult situations.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9

How effectively does this Drill Sergeant manage difference of opinion?		
May force his/her approach to tasks on others without seeking their advice or input.	Seeks input and explanations when there are differences of opinion.	Actively tries to resolve conflicts and differences of opinion by seeking input and explanations.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9

Cultural Tolerance		
To what extent does this Drill Sergeant demonstrate understanding of diverse cultural and social backgrounds?		
Does not understand or show respect for other cultural practices or beliefs; makes insensitive comments or slurs to others based on social, cultural, or gender differences.	Recognizes the need to be tolerant and respectful of other cultural, ethnic, and belief systems but does not always demonstrate understanding of cultural diversity.	Shows tolerance, understanding and respect for other cultural, ethnic, and belief systems; shows respect for social and cultural diversity.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
To what extent does this Drill Sergeant work well with persons of differing cultural and social backgrounds?		
Does not work, socialize, or communicate effectively with Trainees or DS from different backgrounds.	Willing to work with and assist Trainees or DS from different backgrounds, but does not do so easily.	Communicates and works well with others regardless of background; encourages attitudes of tolerance and respect.
LOW	**MODERATE**	**HIGH**
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9

Appendix I

Modified BARS

Knowledge of Program of Instruction and Initial Entry Training Philosophy

1. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in teaching/training Drill and Ceremonies?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

2. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in correcting Trainee performance?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

3. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in conducting physical readiness training?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

4. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in conducting and assisting with Basic Rifle Marksmanship training?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

5. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in providing feedback during weapons training?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

6. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in encouraging Trainees during training?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

7. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in coaching, teaching, and mentoring Trainees?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

8. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in motivating Trainees?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

9. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in demonstrating respect for the philosophy and mission of Initial Entry Training?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

10. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in demonstrating respect for Trainees?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

The Drill Sergeant as a Role Model

11. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in demonstrating behavior consistent with Army Values, and Warrior Ethos?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

12. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in following and enforcing IET policies, rules and regulations?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

13. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in setting a professional example with respect to physical fitness?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

14. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in setting a professional example with respect to personal appearance?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

15. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in setting a professional example with respect to military bearing ?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

16. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in managing stress?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

17. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in handling frustrating situations?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

18. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in adapting to change?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Attitude toward the Job and Peers

19. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in demonstrating initiative in performing his/her duties?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

20. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in relating to and working with peers?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

21. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in dealing with difference of opinion?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

22. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in demonstrating understanding of diverse cultural and social backgrounds?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

23. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in performing his/her duties and responsibilities working with persons of differing cultural and social backgrounds?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

24. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in enforcing Safety procedures?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

25. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in counseling subordinates?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

26. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in adhering to and enforcing the Army's policies on fraternization and improper associations?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

27. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in displaying specific duty-related technical and tactical proficiency?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

28. How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in entorcing regulations concerning the Buddy System?

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Appendix J

The Drill Sergeant School Course Description
[http://www.Infantry.army.mil/DrillSgt/ or www.Jackson.army.mil/dss/ provide further information]

Human Relations covers Army policies and regulations on equal opportunity, extremist organizations, homosexuality, ethics, Trainee abuse, suicide risk identification, rape prevention, religious accommodations, improper relationships and prevention of sexual harassment.

Leadership covers leading positively and building a cohesive team, recognizing success, healthy competition, and proper development of trainee leaders and peer instructors. It covers the "INSIST/ASSIST" training philosophy, emphasizing ASSIST and understanding how leader attitudes affect trainees. It covers mass punishment, over competitiveness and identifying and managing personal and trainee stress is included.

Counseling covers learning about counseling, initial interviews, positive performance counseling, special counseling of substandard Soldiers, and counseling of Soldiers with personal problems. It also covers referral agencies and referrals for mental health counseling.

Physical Fitness Training provides instruction in teaching, leading, and assessment of Soldiers in standardized physical training. It also teaches how to develop fitness-training programs, conduct confidence and conditioning obstacle courses, and prepare for/administer the APFT.

Weapons Training focuses on preliminary rifle instruction, concurrent and reinforcement training, including identifying problem shooters and corrective techniques. It covers component parts, maintenance, loading and unloading, function checks, and correcting malfunctions on the M16A2 rifle, the M249 SAW machine gun, and the M203 grenade launcher. It includes M16A2 sighting and aiming, shot grouping and zeroing exercises, providing demonstrations, feedback, and coaching.

Drill and Ceremonies covers correct commands, stationary drill positions and hand salutes, facing movements at the halt, steps in marching, manual of arms, squad drill and platoon drill. It covers talk-through, by-the-numbers, step-by-step methods of instructions (per FM 22-5), and on-the-spot corrections.

Methods of Instruction shows how to prepare, present, manage and conduct training using appropriate methods of instruction, training aids and devices. It covers After Action Reviews and reinforcement and opportunity training.

Hand Grenades includes conduct of hand grenade training, to include teaching, identifying and correcting safety violations; demonstrating throwing techniques; and enforcing standard operating procedures.

Combatives includes bayonet, pugil stick, and unarmed combat training. It covers appropriate commands, proper procedures, identifying and correcting safety hazards, and using combatives to enhance teamwork and the development of confidence and aggressive spirit.

Tactical Training focuses on tactical training, to include tactical foot march, fighting positions and perimeter security, individual and buddy/fire team movement techniques, lane safety, night

infiltration, movement under direct fire, use of MILES equipment, assembly area operations, and supervising and training trainees during a 72 hour field training exercise.

Inspections show correct procedures for conducting in-ranks, barracks, and personal hygiene inspections and the appropriate use of corrective or disciplinary actions and follow-up inspections.

Appendix K

Demographic Data – Drill Sergeant School Candidates [SSG and SFC data may include some Reservists]

Drill Sergeant School January through August 2004 Fort Jackson Classes 5-6; 7-8 and Fort Benning Classes 3-4, 5-6, 7-8

	SGT	%	SSG	%	SFC	%
Number of Graduates	46		206		14	
Gender						
Male	35	76%	186	90%	11	79%
Female	11	24%	20	10%	3	21%
Mean Number Years in Service	7.18		11.38		13.71	
range	4-15		5-19		9-19	
Average Age	27.52		31.57		34.21	
range	22-38		23-40		28-42	
Source						
Volunteer	4	9%	64	31%	4	29%
DA Select	42	91%	132	64%	10	71%
Unknown	0		10	5%	0	
Combat Experience						
Yes	28	61%	146	71%	12	86%
No	18	39%	46	22%	2	14%
Unknown	0		14	7%	0	
Serving at						
Benning	14	30%	84	41%	5	36%
Jackson	28	61%	67	33%	5	36%
Gordon	4	9%	3	1%	1	7%
Sill	0		10	5%	0	
Lee	0		7	3%	2	14%
Aberdeen	0		9	4%	1	7%
Misc. or Unknown	0		26	13%		
MOS (>3) (All other for SGTs were 4 or fewer)						
11B	13		99		5	
11C	2		19		1	
13B	5		6		0	
19D	3		4		0	
42A	5		10		2	
42L	4		7		0	

Appendix L

Drill Sergeant School Performance

Data are from Fort Benning and Fort Jackson only. There were some DSS candidates for whom data were unavailable.

Average Scores on DSS Modules by Candidate Rank

	F06-02 Intro D&C	B02-08 Leader-ship	C03-05 Counseling	F06-10 Manual of Arms	F06-16 Drill Terms	J10-11 TRADO C 350-6	J10-08 General Subjects	Academic Average
ALL SGT N = 45								
Mean	91.56	84.28	81.95	88.76	86.76	94.72	79.89	86.84
St Dev	9.64	7.16	7.74	9.67	9.55	5.90	7.00	3.88
Media n	90	85	83.5	92	88	96.7	76.9	85.69
Mode	100	86.8	83.5	100	90	100	76.9	84.56
ALL SSG N = 198								
Mean	91.49	81.36	83.16	91.96	87.41	94.43	79.42	87.03
St Dev	10.68	7.40	7.37	7.46	8.36	4.99	6.86	4.20
Media n	100	80.2	83.5	96	88	96.7	80.2	87.27
Mode	100	83.5	80.2	96	92	96.7	76.9	87.14
ALL SFC N = 14								
Mean	87.14	81.82	81.75	92.43	86.14	94.34	78.53	86.02
St Dev	13.11	6.09	7.77	9.09	8.39	5.71	6.85	3.99
Median	90	83.5	96	96	88	96.7	81.85	86.04
Mode	100	83.5	100	100	88	90.1	83.50	NA-

Average Final APFT Scores during Drill Sergeant School by Candidate Rank

	SGT	SSG	SFC
N	45	198	14
Mean	261.91	262.72	261.93
St Dev	22.52	26.18	24.62
Median	262	268	254.5
Mode	232	278	245

Appendix M

Measuring "Potential": BARS Ratings by Peers and Cadre during Drill Sergeant School:
Peer and Cadre Ratings

MINIMALLY			MODERATELY			HIGHLY		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

How effective will this Drill Sergeant be in ...

Knowledge of Program of Instruction and Initial Entry Training Philosophy

1. teaching/training Drill and Ceremonies?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	6.74	7.12	6.47	7.01
St dev	1.08	1.03	1.31	1.07

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	6.73	7.06	7.29	7.02
St dev	1.32	1.27	1.35	1.29

2. correcting Trainee performance?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.16	7.49	7.17	7.41
St dev	0.95	0.83	0.86	0.86

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	7.06	7.43	7.50	7.37
St dev	1.28	1.08	1.11	1.13

3. conducting physical readiness training?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.07	7.34	6.69	7.25
St dev	1.09	0.99	1.17	1.03

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	6.94	7.25	7.57	7.22
St dev	1.38	1.21	1.14	1.24

4. conducting and assisting with Basic Rifle Marksmanship training?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.03	7.42	6.77	7.31
St dev	1.06	0.95	1.13	1.00

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	6.96	7.36	7.54	7.30
St dev	1.44	1.17	1.06	1.22

5. providing feedback during weapons training?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.07	7.42	6.83	7.32
St dev	1.05	0.98	1.17	1.01

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	6.90	7.39	7.68	7.33
St dev	1.45	1.21	0.97	1.25

6. encouraging Trainees during training?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.29	7.41	7.13	7.38
St dev	0.84	0.81	0.91	0.82

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	7.20	7.39	7.96	7.39
St dev	1.15	1.07	0.80	1.08

7. coaching, teaching, and mentoring Trainees?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.16	7.42	7.13	7.35
St dev	0.89	0.84	1.06	0.86

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	7.15	7.41	7.79	7.39
St dev	1.20	1.06	0.93	1.09

8. motivating Trainees?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.13	7.23	6.96	7.24
St dev	0.95	0.94	0.96	0.94

CADRE	SGT = 44	SGT = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	7.08	7.35	7.96	7.34
St dev	1.16	1.07	0.72	1.08

9. demonstrating respect for the philosophy and mission of Initial Entry Training?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.32	7.44	7.27	7.41
St dev	0.76	0.66	0.68	0.68

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC	ALL = 259
Mean	7.20	7.47	8.11	7.46
St dev	1.23	0.97	0.71	1.02

10. demonstrating respect for Trainees?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.36	7.41	7.36	7.40
St dev	0.80	0.69	0.63	0.70

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	7.25	7.50	8.25	7.50
St dev	1.19	1.10	0.61	1.11

The Drill Sergeant as a Role Model

11. demonstrating behavior consistent with Army Values and Warrior Ethos?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.39	7.58	7.34	7.52
St dev	0.78	0.74	0.94	0.76

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	7.09	7.62	8.18	7.56
St dev	1.21	0.98	0.75	1.04

12. following and enforcing IET policies, rules and regulations?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.54	7.66	7.57	7.64
St dev	0.65	0.65	0.73	0.66

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	7.22	7.62	8.54	7.60
St dev	1.18	0.99	0.50	1.04

13. setting a professional example with respect to physical fitness?

PEERS	SGT=51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.23	7.45	6.96	7.38
St dev	1.15	0.97	1.18	1.02

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	6.92	7.33	8.00	7.29
St dev	1.28	1.20	1.11	1.22

14. setting a professional example with respect to personal appearance?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC= 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.32	7.55	7.37	7.50
St dev	0.98	0.86	0.88	0.89

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	7.13	7.57	8.14	7.52
St dev	1.23	1.03	1.15	1.07

15. setting a professional example with respect to military bearing?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.19	7.51	7.29	7.44
St dev	0.99	0.83	0.94	0.87

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	7.09	7.60	8.29	7.55
St dev	1.13	1.04	0.78	1.07

16. managing stress?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	6.91	7.17	6.92	7.11
St dev	1.05	0.91	0.94	0.94

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	6.67	7.24	7.93	7.18
St dev	1.34	1.05	0.90	1.13

17. handling frustrating situations?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	6.85	7.11	6.73	7.04
St dev	1.08	0.93	0.98	0.97

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	6.69	7.25	7.86	7.18
St dev	1.24	1.07	0.86	1.12

18. adapting to change?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	6.99	7.18	6.80	7.12
St dev	1.01	0.89	0.88	0.92

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	6.85	7.35	7.82	7.29
St dev	1.22	1.02	0.95	1.07

Attitude toward the Job and Peers

19. demonstrating initiative in performing his/her duties?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.07	7.39	7.07	7.32
St dev	0.86	0.95	1.04	0.95

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	7.10	7.51	7.79	7.46
St dev	1.17	0.99	1.12	1.04

20. relating to and working with peers?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.24	7.43	7.06	7.37
St dev	0.94	0.88	0.98	0.90

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	7.15	7.63	7.86	7.56
St dev	1.11	0.91	0.72	0.96

21. dealing with difference of opinion?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	6.96	7.13	6.69	7.08
St dev	1.04	0.85	1.16	0.91

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	7.02	7.43	8.04	7.39
St dev	1.21	0.96	0.60	1.01

22. demonstrating understanding of diverse cultural and social backgrounds?

PEERS	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	7.35	7.65	8.18	7.63
St dev	0.95	0.82	0.75	0.85

CADRE	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.59	7.61	7.51	7.59
St dev	0.77	0.70	0.75	0.71

23. performing duties/responsibilities working with persons of differing cultural and social backgrounds?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.66	7.62	7.46	7.62
St dev	0.81	0.65	0.67	0.68

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	7.34	7.68	8.18	7.65
St dev	1.01	0.81	0.64	0.86

24. enforcing Safety procedures?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.75	7.83	7.69	7.81
St dev	0.57	0.56	0.54	0.56

CADRE	SGT=44	SSG=201	SFC=14	ALL=259
Mean	7.76	7.77	8.29	7.80
St dev	1.05	0.87	0.73	0.90

25. counseling subordinates?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.08	7.39	7.37	7.33
St dev	0.88	0.71	0.88	0.76

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	7.06	7.48	8.29	7.45
St dev	1.29	0.99	0.70	1.06

26. adhering to and enforcing the Army's policies on fraternization and improper associations?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.87	7.86	7.84	7.86
St dev	0.59	0.60	0.57	0.60

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	7.45	7.85	8.43	7.81
St dev	1.23	0.88	0.85	0.97

27. displaying specific duty-related technical and tactical proficiency?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.31	7.62	7.23	7.54
St dev	0.90	0.86	0.98	0.88

CADRE	SGT =44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	7.27	7.64	8.14	7.61
St dev	1.14	1.00	0.89	1.03

28. enforcing regulations concerning the Buddy System?

PEERS	SGT = 51	SSG = 206	SFC = 15	ALL = 272
Mean	7.92	7.99	7.96	7.97
St dev	0.55	0.52	0.42	0.52

CADRE	SGT = 44	SSG = 201	SFC = 14	ALL = 259
Mean	7.66	7.89	8.54	7.89
St dev	0.94	0.85	0.54	0.87

Appendix N

BARS Ratings in the IET Unit

LOW			MODERATE			HIGH		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Independent Group t-tests with pooled variance compared the mean rating of SGTs and SSGs. A Bonferroni correction for multiple (32) comparisons made the critical t-value for 76 equal to 3.28.

How effectively does this Drill Sergeant/how well does this Drill Sergeant ...

Knowledge of Program of Instruction and Initial Entry Training Philosophy

1. teach Drill and Ceremonies?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	6.73	.93	8.75	5.00
GOR	5	6.71	.92	7.75	5.25
BNG	14	6.97	1.03	8.75	5.57
JAX	31	6.62	.89	8.40	5.00
SSGs	28	7.31	1.04	8.75	5.00

$t_{(76)} = 2.53$, n.s.

2. correct Trainee performance?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	6.82	.95	8.78	4.00
GOR	5	6.58	1.48	7.67	4.00
BNG	14	7.14	1.09	8.78	5.00
JAX	31	6.72	.78	8.00	4.83
SSGs	28	7.57	1.20	9.00	5.00

$t_{(76)} = 3.04$, n.s.

3. conduct physical readiness training?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	7.35	.86	8.89	4.71
GOR	5	7.42	.86	8.33	6.00
BNG	14	7.59	1.11	8.89	4.71
JAX	31	7.23	.74	8.60	5.67
SSGs	28	7.79	.96	9.00	5.33

$t_{(76)} = 2.08$, n.s.

4. display specific warrior focused knowledge and skills?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	6.56	.88	8.67	5.00
GOR	5	6.40	.84	7.67	5.57
BNG	14	6.96	1.01	8.67	5.71
JAX	31	6.41	.78	8.38	5.00
SSGs	28	7.48	1.24	9.00	4.33

$t_{(76)} = 3.81$, $p < .05$

Weapons Training

5. how knowledgeable about the M16 series rifle?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	6.93	.94	8.67	4.60
GOR	5	6.48	1.04	7.25	5.00
BNG	14	7.54	.77	8.67	6.57
JAX	31	6.11	.89	8.25	4.60
SSGs	28	7.79	1.23	9.00	4.33

$t_{(76)} = 3.46$, $p < .05$

6. conduct/assist with Basic Rifle Marksmanship training?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	6.68	1.00	8.78	4.00
GOR	5	5.56	1.22	6.80	4.00
BNG	14	7.44	.88	8.78	5.86
JAX	31	6.47	.80	8.00	5.00
SSGs	28	7.70	1.27	9.00	4.33

$t_{(76)} = 3.91$, $p < .05$

7. provide feedback during weapons training?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	6.69	.96	8.56	4.00
GOR	5	5.83	1.31	7.00	4.00
BNG	14	7.27	.89	8.56	5.57
JAX	31	6.54	.83	8.00	4.67
SSGs	28	7.63	1.26	9.00	4.67

$t_{(76)} = 3.70$, $p < .05$

8. follow safety guidelines?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	7.42	.70	9.00	5.25
GOR	5	7.11	1.14	8.33	5.25
BNG	14	7.51	.83	9.00	5.88
JAX	31	7.43	.56	8.25	6.33
SSGs	28	7.96	.92	9.00	6.50

$t_{(76)} = 2.91$, n.s.

Instructional Techniques

9. encourage Trainees during training?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	7.16	.81	8.67	4.88
GOR	5	6.99	1.14	8.33	5.25
BNG	14	7.02	1.21	8.67	4.88
JAX	31	7.25	.51	8.40	6.17
SSGs	28	7.83	.92	9.00	6.00

$t_{(76)} = 3.34$, $p < .05$

10. teach, coach, and mentor Trainees?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	6.91	.93	8.67	4.00
GOR	5	6.52	1.53	8.00	4.00
BNG	14	7.03	1.21	8.67	4.88
JAX	31	6.91	.66	8.40	5.40
SSGs	28	7.50	1.09	9.00	5.33

$t_{(76)} = 2.52$, n.s.

11. motivate Trainees?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Low
SGTs	50	6.92	.90	8.60	4.63
GOR	5	6.95	1.29	8.33	5.00
BNG	14	6.96	1.17	8.56	4.63
JAX	31	6.89	.72	8.60	5.40
SSGs	28	7.67	.93	9.00	6.00

$t_{(76)} = 3.49$, $p < .05$

12. demonstrate respect for the philosophy and mission of Initial Entry Training?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Low
SGTs	50	7.03	.87	8.78	3.75
GOR	5	6.23	1.49	7.67	3.75
BNG	14	7.13	.93	8.78	5.50
JAX	31	7.11	.66	8.17	5.20
SSGs	28	7.57	1.00	9.00	6.00

$t_{(76)} = 2.49$, n.s.

13. demonstrate respect for Trainees?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	7.17	.99	8.77	3.50
GOR	5	6.86	2.00	8.67	3.50
BNG	14	6.96	1.12	8.44	4.38
JAX	31	7.31	.67	8.77	5.80
SSGs	28	7.58	1.01	9.00	6.00

$t_{(76)} = 1.74$, n.s.

14. counsel Trainees?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	6.62	.85	8.44	4.75
GOR	5	6.60	1.27	8.33	4.75
BNG	14	6.64	1.06	8.44	5.00
JAX	31	6.61	.69	7.80	5.33
SSGs	28	7.38	1.20	9.00	4.50

$t_{(76)} = 3.26$, n.s.

15. follow regulations about the Buddy system?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	7.73	.94	9.00	3.25
GOR	5	7.14	2.24	9.00	3.25
BNG	14	7.55	.87	8.78	5.71
JAX	31	7.90	.57	8.89	6.57
SSGs	28	8.20	.93	9.00	6.00

$t_{(76)} = 2.12$, n.s.

Drill Sergeant as a Role Model

Integrity, Discipline and Adherence to Army Values

16. demonstrate behavior consistent with Army values?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	7.58	.89	9.00	4.25
GOR	5	7.29	1.85	9.00	4.25
BNG	14	7.64	.96	8.89	5.88
JAX	31	7.60	.64	8.75	6.33
SSGs	28	8.15	.93	9.00	6.00

$t_{(76)} = 2.67$, n.s.

17. follow and enforce IET rules and regulations?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	7.46	1.04	8.89	2.75
GOR	5	7.00	2.40	8.50	2.75
BNG	14	7.40	1.14	8.89	4.50
JAX	31	7.56	.63	8.60	6.42
SSGs	28	8.11	.89	9.00	6.33

$t_{(76)} = 2.78$, n.s.

Military Bearing and Appearance

18. set a good example for Trainees with respect to physical fitness?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	7.63	.99	9.00	4.00
GOR	5	7.88	.79	8.75	7.00
BNG	14	7.50	1.50	8.89	4.00
JAX	31	7.64	.73	9.00	6.00
SSGs	28	8.06	.83	9.00	6.00

$t_{(76)} = 1.94$, n.s.

19. setting a good example for Trainees with respect to personal appearance?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	7.83	.84	9.00	5.29
GOR	5	7.85	1.12	8.75	6.00
BNG	14	7.65	1.12	9.00	5.29
JAX	31	7.91	.65	9.00	6.17
SSGs	28	8.15	.86	9.00	6.00

$t_{(76)} = 1.60$, n.s.

20. set a good example for Trainees with respect to military bearing?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	7.60	.95	8.88	4.00
GOR	5	7.10	1.86	8.67	4.00
BNG	14	7.64	1.08	8.88	5.38
JAX	31	7.67	.69	8.80	6.17
SSGs	28	8.07	.91	9.00	6.33

$t_{(76)} = 2.13$, n.s.

21. adhere to the Army's policies on fraternization?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	7.95	1.04	9.00	2.75
GOR	5	7.25	2.55	9.00	2.75
BNG	14	7.84	.91	8.78	5.29
JAX	31	8.11	.65	8.63	6.67
SSGs	28	8.30	1.02	9.00	5.00

$t_{(76)} = 1.43$, n.s.

Ability to Manage Stress and Anger

22. manage stress?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	7.04	1.05	8.50	3.50
GOR	5	6.29	1.85	8.25	3.50
BNG	14	6.98	1.25	8.44	3.63
JAX	31	7.19	.74	8.50	4.80
SSGs	28	7.65	1.05	8.30	3.50

$t_{(76)} = 2.46$, n.s.

23. handle potentially volatile situations?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	6.99	1.00	8.56	3.75
GOR	5	6.48	1.66	8.00	3.75
BNG	14	7.02	1.24	8.56	3.86
JAX	31	7.05	.74	8.33	5.67
SSGs	28	7.71	.82	9.00	5.33

$t_{(76)} = 3.24$, n.s.

24. react in unexpected, frustrating situations?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	6.77	1.05	8.67	3.57
GOR	5	6.66	1.56	8.00	4.25
BNG	14	6.80	1.40	8.67	3.57
JAX	31	6.78	.80	7.88	4.40
SSGs	28	7.61	.98	9.00	4.33

$t_{(76)} = 3.47$, $p<.05$

Adaptability

25. adapt to change?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	6.85	.92	8.67	4.50
GOR	5	6.89	1.34	8.00	4.50
BNG	14	7.01	1.05	8.67	5.25
JAX	31	6.81	.81	8.20	4.67
SSGs	28	7.63	1.149	9.00	4.33

$t_{(76)} = 3.28$, $p< .05$

Attitude toward Drill Sergeant Duty and Peers

Level of Effort and Initiative

26. effort put forth performing Drill sergeant duties?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	7.07	1.07	8.89	4.29
GOR	5	6.82	1.42	8.33	4.50
BNG	14	7.31	1.39	8.89	4.29
JAX	31	7.00	.84	8.22	4.40
SSGs	28	7.89	1.13	9.00	5.33

$t_{(76)} = 3.18$, n.s.

27. show initiative performing Drill Sergeant duties?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	6.95	1.11	8.86	4.25
GOR	5	6.84	1.63	8.67	4.25
BNG	14	7.23	1.35	8.82	4.29
JAX	31	6.84	.90	8.40	4.40
SSGs	28	7.78	1.18	9.00	5.00

$t_{(76)} = 3.10$, n.s.

28. seek additional responsibilities?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	6.64	1.10	8.67	4.00
GOR	5	6.46	1.12	7.67	4.75
BNG	14	6.95	1.31	8.67	4.43
JAX	31	6.53	.99	8.20	4.00
SSGs	28	7.58	1.04	9.00	4.50

$t_{(76)} = 3.53$, $p < .05$

Relating to and Supporting Peers

29. relate to and work with peers?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	7.14	1.09	8.78	3.75
GOR	5	6.53	1.65	8.00	3.75
BNG	14	7.39	1.16	8.78	4.86
JAX	31	7.13	.90	8.40	5.00
SSGs	28	7.93	1.10	9.00	4.33

$t_{(76)} = 3.06$, n.s.

30. manage difference of opinion?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	6.79	1.05	9.00	3.33
GOR	5	6.29	1.11	7.33	4.50
BNG	14	6.87	1.44	9.00	3.33
JAX	31	6.83	.83	8.20	4.50
SSGs	28	7.60	1.13	9.00	4.33

$t_{(76)} = 3.18$, n.s.

Cultural Tolerance

31 demonstrate understanding of diverse cultural and social backgrounds?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	7.59	.74	8.75	5.25
GOR	5	7.10	1.18	8.33	5.25
BNG	14	7.73	.72	8.75	6.00
JAX	31	7.60	.67	8.50	5.50
SSGs	28	8.11	.85	9.00	6.00

$t_{(76)} = 2.82$, n.s.

32. work well with persons of differing cultural and social backgrounds?

Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	Highest	Lowest
SGTs	50	7.73	.79	9.00	5.33
GOR	5	7.38	1.10	8.67	5.75
BNG	14	7.76	.94	9.00	5.57
JAX	31	7.78	.67	8.83	5.33
SSGs	28	8.16	.88	9.00	6.00

$t_{(76)} = 2.21$, n.s.

Appendix O

E-mail Survey

Dear Drill Sergeant,

When you graduated from Drill Sergeant School your class was considered a part of the Sergeants as Drill Sergeants Program. We'd like to ask a few questions now that you are in your unit. There is no hurry – we know you are very busy – but the more data we can get the better. We will not quote you by name, and if you don't want any more mail from us, please just say so.

If you start by forwarding the note back ... you can answer right in the message itself– or do whatever is easiest for you.

If you have been diverted, and are not currently serving as a Drill Sergeant, please let us know that as well!

Thank you in advance for your help – we will see you soon at your unit location (most of you anyway) – and again, thank you for all you do to turn young men and women into Soldiers. Our Country is in your debt.

QUESTIONS:

1. What was your rank when you reported in for duty at your unit after Drill Sergeant School?

2. Describe your reception and integration at the unit. Were there any challenges?

3. Had you been assigned to that unit before you went to DSS?

4. How many complete cycles have you seen so far?

5. Think about your first cycle – did it meet your expectations? If not, how not?

6. Did you have a mentor? If so, for how long? How did that person help you?

7. Did you turtle or shadow someone at the beginning? If so, for how long?

8. Have you been PI or AI in major classes (like BRM, EO, etc.)?

9. What sort of role have you played in PT? Teaching it – or leading it – or both?

10. Have you encountered any situations where you needed to provide special counseling for a Trainee? If so, describe *briefly*. Was your DSS training adequate in teaching you how to deal with the problem? If not, what kind of problem was it? Did you seek help from someone else?

11. Have there been any issues with Gender Integrated Training? Was this subject adequately covered in DSS?

12. What's the hardest thing so far about being a Drill Sergeant?

13. Did you feel you were getting any special treatment or attention because of the rank you hold?

14. In general, how's it going?

15. What did we forget to ask?

Thank you for your help.

Appendix P

Department of Army Memos Requesting and Approving Sergeants as Drill Sergeants Policy Change

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND
162 MCNAIR DRIVE
FORT MONROE VIRGINIA 23651-1047

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

ATTG-E (350)

02 JUL 2003

MEMORANDUM FOR General John M. Keane, Acting Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, 200 Army Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20310-0200

SUBJECT: Sergeants as Drill Sergeants

1. Enclosed is a briefing on TRADOC's proposal for a 1-year, Proof-of-Principle Test on incorporating sergeants into the Drill Sergeant Program.

2. With numerous modifications to the Initial Entry Training environment, combined with the maturity and experience of sergeants throughout The Army, it is time to utilize sergeants as drill sergeants. Recognizing that drill sergeant duty is not for all noncommissioned officers, regardless of rank, this Proof-of-Principle Test will examine incorporating the Army's best sergeants into the Drill Sergeant Program.

3. Briefing explains TRADOC's position that selected sergeants serving on drill sergeant duty is in the best interest of both the U.S. Army and the NCO Corps.

4. TRADOC point of contact is LTC Ed Kuster, DSN 680-5602, kusterej@monroe.army.mil. 5721

Encl

KEVIN P. BYRNES
General, U.S. Army
Commanding

Kevin Let's give this very high on this as well. SMA
30 JUL 2003

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND
102 MCNAIR DRIVE
FORT MONROE VIRGINIA 23651-1047

ATTG-II (350)

25 Jan 05

MEMORANDUM FOR Chief of Staff, United States Army,
200 Army Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20310-0200

SUBJECT: Sergeants as Drill Sergeants

1. Request change to current policy which prohibits Sergeants serving as Drill Sergeants. Sergeants have demonstrated they are capable of performing duties as Drill Sergeants, and I recommend we allow them to do so.

2. The Army discontinued using Sergeants as Drill Sergeants in 1997 as a reaction to the Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG), MD, incident and subsequent studies; i.e., DAIG Report, 1997; Kassebaum-Baker Report; and Senior Review Panel Report on Sexual Harassment.

3. Given the operational demands on our NCO Corps, and after discussion with CSMs from across the Army, TRADOC recommended to the Chief of Staff of the Army (CSA), GEN Shinseki, that we reconsider the prohibition. On 30 Jul 03, General Shinseki approved a 1-year Proof of Principle test to incorporate Sergeants into the Drill Sergeant Program. As of Oct 04 the Army Research Institute (ARI), under HQ TRADOC supervision, conducted a study on the performance of Sergeants as Drill Sergeants. Interim Report dated 23 Nov 04, Sergeants as Drill Sergeants Study, states there are few differences between Sergeant Drill Sergeants and more senior Drill Sergeants regarding their leadership attributes and demonstrated capabilities. There are no adverse reports associated with Sergeant Drill Sergeants in the training environment.

4. Expect there is minimal risk in approving immediate implementation of Sergeants as Drill Sergeants in Basic Combat Training (BCT), Advanced Individual Training (AIT), and One Station Unit Training (OSUT) in either Gender Integrated or non-Gender Integrated Training (GIT) environments.

ATTG-II
SUBJECT: Sergeants as Drill Sergeants

5. Propose the following as assignment criteria: Meet current Army selection/screening criteria in accordance with Army Regulation 614-200, and the following:

a. Be a PLDC graduate.

b. Have Battalion Commander recommendation.

c. Have a minimum of 4 years TIS; minimum of 1 year TIG.

d. Have 2 years service remaining after DS duty.

e. Have a GT Score of 100.

f. Pass psychological screening.

g. Pass HRC records screening.

6. Approval of this recommendation will also relieve a shortage of Staff Sergeants and Sergeants First Class who serve as Drill Sergeants in an expanding training base.

7. Pending your approval, TRADOC will work with HRC to begin programming Sergeants into the summer 2005 Drill Sergeant Schools.

KEVIN P. BYRNES
General, U.S. Army
Commanding

CF:
Commander, HRC
DCS, G-1

UNITED STATES ARMY
THE CHIEF OF STAFF

FEB 2 8 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR COMMANDING GENERAL, HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND, 102 MCNAIR DRIVE, FORT MONROE, VA 23651-1047

SUBJECT: Sergeants as Drill Sergeants

1. Reference memorandum, ATTG-II, 25 January 2005, SAB, enclosure 1.

2. Your request to authorize the assignment of Sergeants as Drill Sergeants is approved.

3. Commander, US Army Human Resources Command will take necessary action to incorporate this change into Army regulations.

PETER J. SCHOOMAKER
General, US Army

Encl

CF:
CDR, AHRC